UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 00313698 3

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/memoriesofmanage00frohuoft

33
21LR

MEMORIES OF A MANAGER



Paul Frohman

MEMORIES OF A MANAGER

Reminiscences of the Old Lyceum and of Some Players of the Last Quarter Century

BY
DANIEL FROHMAN

ILLUSTRATED

LONDON
WILLIAM HEINEMANN
1911

Stuart Robinson

MEMORIES OF A MANAGER

Reminiscences of the Old Lyceum and of Some Players of the Last Quarter Century

BY
DANIEL FROHMAN

ILLUSTRATED

LONDON
WILLIAM HEINEMANN
1911

Printed in New York, U. S. A.

All rights reserved, including that of translation
into foreign languages including the Scandinavian

PN
2266
F7

TO MY FRIEND, ISAAC F. MARCOSSON

BUT FOR WHOSE ZEAL THESE REMINISCENCES WOULD
NEVER HAVE BEEN WRITTEN

PREFACE

This book is not a literary presentment of ideas and criticisms of the stage and its people, but a statement of facts, incidents and experiences of stage life and some random observations, during twenty-five years of management.

I had been frequently urged to put these remembrances of nearby stage life into type, and they were originally published in the columns of The Saturday Evening Post.

They are (now much amplified and elaborated) offered to the public as a tribute to a profession it has been an honor to serve.

CONTENTS

PART I

CHAPTER I.

EARLY DAYS OF THE LYCEUM THEATRE 3

The stock companies of 1886 — The Lyceum for modern dramas — Mr. Sothern's appearance in Helen Dauvray's company — Preliminaries to the stock company's season — Getting The Highest Bidder ready.

CHAPTER II.

SOTHERN AND THE HIGHEST BIDDER 12

The success of the play in doubt at rehearsals — The first night and climax of interest — Difficulty of judging results at rehearsals, and the reasons — Managers' opinions of plays — Sending a Highest Bidder messenger boy to Europe — Edwin Booth visits the play — Supper with Booth — Booth at Honolulu — Booth and the King.

CHAPTER III.

SOME EARLY TRIUMPHS AND FIRST APPEARANCES ... 23

Death of Charles Bishop during the play, and anecdote — William Gillette's early success — Beginnings of "road" companies — First appearances of some famous actors — Richard Mansfield and his efforts to vitalize a play — Mansfield and Candida — George Bernard Shaw's joke — Brief management of Richard Mansfield.

CHAPTER IV.

THE LYCEUM STOCK COMPANY 32

H. C. De Mille and David Belasco engaged to write The Wife — Their methods of work — The first company — How The Wife, rewritten, was boomed

Using Chauncey Depew — Bronson Howard's failure — An actor's trick in facial expression — The significance of stage business.

CHAPTER V.

EXPERIENCES WITH AUTHORS..... 44

Bronson Howard's methods of work — Constructing a play — His character — The bane of the drama — Rich actors and poor playwrights — What Bartley Campbell did — Experience with Mark Twain's plays — Col. Sellers written for Edwin Booth. Going to law with Twain.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PINERO PLAYS AT THE LYCEUM..... 54

Legitimatizing Sweet Lavender — The taste of the public in the '80's — History of The Second Mrs. Tanqueray — The discovery of Mrs. Pat Campbell — Other plays of Pinero — Experiences on the road — Trelawny of The Wells and its admirable cast — A Farewell — Athletics in The Amazon.

CHAPTER VII.

THE HENRY ARTHUR JONES PLAYS AND OTHERS..... 66

An experience with Sardou — His plays for the Lyceum — A success and a failure — The Case of Rebellious Susan — Mr. Jones's early days — The Dancing Girl the crossroads in Sothern's career — The Prisoner of Zenda — Jas. K. Hackett as a gallery boy at the Lyceum — Maude Adams's first appearance — Moving to Daly's Theatre.

CHAPTER VIII.

SOME STARS OF THE '80's..... 78

The old and new members of the company — Georgia Cayvan, the first leading lady — The emergence of Henry Miller — First appearance at the Lyceum of Virginia Harned — Ethel Barrymore becomes a star — Margaret Anglin as the slavey in Lord Chumley — Julia Marlowe begins her career — Some other noted actresses — A milliner as a theatrical adjunct.

CHAPTER IX.

DION BOUCICAULT'S LAST EFFORTS AT THE DRAMA.. 87

Boucicault attempts two plays for the Lyceum — Extracts from his letters to the manager — His failure — Boucicault's theatre-going habits — His advice to dramatists — Why Thespians disbelieve in the Baconian theory.

CHAPTER X.

SHAKESPEARE AT THE FIRST REHEARSAL OF HAMLET 95

The peculiar construction of Hamlet — Hamlet as a hero — Constructive defects — The Bard in Hamlet writes a melodrama — The play as first designed — The first rehearsal — The actors and their objections — Shakespeare placates the performer of Polonius — Troubles of the author.

CHAPTER XI.

THE KENDALS' AMERICAN TRIUMPHS. MANAGEMENT OF MADAME MODJESKA..... 102

Why the Kendals were engaged for the old Haymarket Theatre — Kendal prepares for failure — Mrs. Kendal's first appearance in New York — Her health and humour — Kendal as a draughtsman — Their American experiences — The omnipresent cuspidor — Kendal a great smoker—Why they have always acted together —Association with Madame Modjeska—Her charm as Adrienne Lecouvreur — Her sad and merry moods — First meeting with her husband — Her wonderful fortitude during an illness in Baltimore — The demonstrative dogs in Princess Zillah — A Stamford dog story — The taste for Shakespeare — Olga Nethersole — The two Carmens (Calvé and Nethersole) aboard ship.

CHAPTER XII.

THE DISCOVERY OF KUBELIK. NEW CONDITIONS..... 127

Hearing Kubelik play in London — His success in New York — Attitude of the critics — Anecdote of the late Wm. C. Whitney — New theatrical conditions — The old stock companies and the star system.

PART II

CHAPTER I.

THE COMPOSITION OF PLAYS 139

The public's verdict of success — The history of a manuscript — The stupidity of managers — Predictions usually uncertain — Dion Boucicault's methods — Shakespeare and the box office — Accidents at rehearsals — Attractiveness of theme — Problem plays — Rehearsals reveal opportunities — Failures of well made plays — Qualities of accepted successes — Requirements of the modern stage — Changes effected by conditions in life.

CHAPTER II.

WHY PLAYS FAIL 153

Importance of the primary passions — Elements of good and evil — Significance of the dramatic motive — Importance of concentrated interest — Too much movement — Absence of engrossing interest — A significant example — Parts make actors — Ibsen and his methods — Education in the drama not desired — Appeal to the emotions.

CHAPTER III.

THE A B C OF THE PLAY-BUILDER'S ART..... 160

Models of well made plays — The Two Orphans, Fedora, Camille — Barrie's plays — The Silver King — Character of the stock company — Plays for stars — Sardou's star rôles — Importance of a good stage manager — Qualifications which he must possess.

CHAPTER IV.

PLAYS AND PLAYERS ABROAD..... 171

John T. Raymond's financial foresight — Kindness of the London press — Eagerness for London endorsements — Joseph Jefferson's experience — John E. Owens — Edwin Booth's artistic success — Lawrence Barrett's tragic experience — The elder Sothern in London — Success of Lord Dundreary — Mary Anderson appears as Parthenia — Mary Anderson and the Prince of Wales.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER V.

THE AUGUSTIN DALY COMPANY AND OTHERS..... 181

Richard Mansfield's failure — Mr. and Mrs. McKee Rankin — Arizona — Augustin Daly and The Big Four — William Gillette's success — Anecdotes— Mr. and Mrs. N. C. Goodwin — Success of Grace George — Willie Collier — Experience of The Lion and the Mouse — Bronson Howard's plays in London — Success of Mrs. Wiggs of The Cabbage Patch — American caricatures popular.

CHAPTER VI.

ENGLISH TASTE NOT INCLINED TO FOREIGN PLAYS.. 190

Predilections of London theatregoers — The well-bred English actor — American opportunities for young men — English authors and English audiences — French for the Frenchman — Anglicization of foreign works — The travelling American in London — Cosmopolitan taste of America — Drama an art requiring no cultivated taste.

CHAPTER VII.

A FINAL CHAPTER ON THE DRAMA OF TO-DAY 197

Good plays hailed with delight — Educational drama not popular — The appeal to the emotions — Teaching the lessons of life — Appeal to the multitude — Literature and the drama — Practical character of the modern theatre — Soliloquy a bad form of art — Limited public for literary plays — The drama of action.

APPENDIX.....203

History of The Lyceum Theatre by dates of the productions of plays — Daly's Theatre under Daniel Frohman's management — Casts of famous First Nights.

ILLUSTRATIONS

Daniel Frohman . . . . . *Frontispiece*

FACING PAGE

E. H. Sothern in 1886 6

E. H. Sothern in The Prisoner of Zenda 6

E. H. Sothern, H. C. De Mille and David Belasco arranging a scene at rehearsal. . 10

The Lyceum Theatre Company, 1887–8 . 34

Henry Miller, Herbert Kelcey, and Nelson Wheatcroft in The Wife 38

Hilda Spong 42

May Robson in Lady Bountiful 42

W. J. Le Moyne and Mrs. Charles Walcot in a scene from The Wife 46

Elsie Leslie in The Prince and the Pauper 48

W. J. Le Moyne, Mrs. Whiffen, Herbert Kelcey, Henry Miller, and Georgia Cayvan in Sweet Lavender 52

Sir Arthur Pinero 54

FACING PAGE

James K. Hackett and Mary Mannering in The Princess and the Butterfly . . . 58

Hilda Spong in Trelawny of the Wells . 60

A scene from Pinero's Trelawny of the Wells 64

Sketch of a scene in Americans Abroad, by Sardou, with his instructions . . . 66

Walter Hale and Isabel Irving in The Case of Rebellious Susan 68

Mr. Henry Arthur Jones 70

James K. Hackett and Bertha Galland in The Pride of Jennico 74

Hilda Spong, Rhoda Cameron, and John Mason in The Ambassador 76

Georgia Cayvan 78

A distinguished group of several of Mr. Frohman's old-time stars 84

Herbert Kelcey and Georgia Cayvan in Old Heads and Young Hearts 92

Mr. and Mrs. Kendal at Niagara Falls, May 13, 1890 102

FACING PAGE

Mr. and Mrs. Kendal in The Second Mrs. Tanqueray 106

Mrs. Kendal and her daughters, Margaret and Dorothy 106

Madame Modjeska in 1886 112

Paderewski, at the time of Mme. Modjeska's Benefit 118

Miss Olga Nethersole 122

Kubelik, at the time of his first appearance in America 128

An accident at a rehearsal of Captain Lettarblair 146

Maude Adams, E. H. Sothern, and Belle Archer in Lord Chumley 148

An accident at a rehearsal with E. H. Sothern incorporated in Lord Chumley . 148

Augustus Thomas reading a play to Daniel Frohman, Fred Williams and E. G. Unitt 158

The duel scene in Sheridan 162

Edwin Booth, 1892 174

PART ONE

CHAPTER ONE

EARLY DAYS OF THE LYCEUM THEATRE

I USED to come to New York once or twice a season from my youthful wanderings about America as advance agent of a "one-night-stand" show. Theatrical people are always fond of the theatre. With me the delights of the play were always keen; so on these home-comings, I usually spent my evenings in watching the splendid performances of Palmer's Company at the Union Square Theatre, and those of Lester Wallack's Company, then at Broadway and Thirteenth Street. It was always a sad day when I had to quit these alluring experiences and go back again into the provinces to boom the show that I represented; but I had a dream that sometime I might have a theatre and a company of my own, when I, too, could produce plays,

engage actors, and add to the dramatic gayety of the city. On one of these occasions, when the lure of the city and its prospects was strong within me, I found myself in Philadelphia. William Gillette was there, playing a part in a play not his own. One night, he, Mr. Bradford Merrill, then a theatrical reporter on the Philadelphia *Press*, and I walked about the streets and talked of our several ambitions. Each of us expressed the desire that lay within us. Gillette said his ambition was to be an actor in his own plays. Merrill hoped sometime to rise to the dignity of becoming the managing editor of a metropolitan newspaper. My ambition has already been expressed. Some years later we three met again. Each had accomplished his wish.

In 1886 I organized the Lyceum Theatre Stock Company, which not only made history for the little playhouse at Fourth Avenue and Twenty-third Street but became — as some one aptly remarked — "a star factory." I hoped there

to tempt fortune with plays that might repeat or at least continue the prestige that had been reflected from the older houses that had passed away, for the old order had begun to change. The splendid career of the Wallack Company, with its remarkable artists and its repertoire of old comedies, had ceased. Palmer's Union Square Company was no more, though Mr. Palmer, with his brilliant record, had now assumed the management of the Madison Square Theatre, and afterward, for a time, of Wallack's uptown house. Augustin Daly continued to delight theatregoers with his superb organization.

At the Lyceum Theatre I came into the field to produce modern dramas. When it was first understood that a pretentious stock company was to find a home at the Lyceum, a number of my brother managers on Broadway disparaged the idea, and said I was too far over on the East Side for such a venture; that Broadway was the only place for a first-class theatre. But, during the run of my first play, when it chanced to prove a

very great success and people were turned away from every performance, I had occasion to remind some of my brother managers, who were then playing to empty houses on the Great White Way, of their criticism. I told them that I felt that they were on the wrong street. Over on the East Side, on Fourth Avenue, was the place for business!

The Lyceum Theatre was originally the inspiration of the late Steele Mackaye, whose Hazel Kirke had already made the fortune of the little Madison Square Theatre. The first play — in 1885 — at the Lyceum had been Mackaye's Dakolar. In the cast were Robert Mantell, John Mason and Viola Allen. This management continued until the following season, when Miss Helen Dauvray undertook the direction of that house, with a new play by Bronson Howard called One of Our Girls. After Miss Dauvray's first season, I became the manager of this theatre but rented her the house for a short period of my first term.

E. H. SOTHERN
In 1886

E. H. SOTHERN
in The Prisoner of Zenda

In her company was E. H. Sothern. I had known Mr. Sothern some years. He first called upon me as a youth in the earlier days at the Madison Square Theatre. The first time he called he came with his sister, a young girl. They both desired engagements. I had seen his father act and was interested in the son of so distinguished an actor. Unfortunately we had no work. I told him possibly there would be a chance in the near future. He came several times, not knowing exactly what period of time was covered by my answer; but we had long runs at this house, and I had then no opportunity for him. I little thought then that I should, at a later time, be paying him a salary of fifty thousand dollars a year, and that he would still later receive, as he did from Charles Frohman, a salary of one hundred thousand dollars a year for two years.

Sothern was always a hard worker, ambitious and conscientious — the first man in the theatre, and the last one out of it. Rehearsals, then as

now, were his delight. No hours were too short for him when away from the theatre, and no days too long when at work rehearsing. His capacity for work was prodigious. Every movement, gesture and accent of his part, and the parts of his company, were always carefully considered and worked out. In those days David Belasco was my stage manager. Later he was succeeded by Fred Williams, the father of Fritz Williams, the actor. From these clever experts Mr. Sothern soon learned to become his own stage manager, and I regard him as one of the keenest and most expert I have ever seen.

In watching Mr. Sothern's work while in the Dauvray Company at the Lyceum, I soon discovered that he was not only exceedingly popular with the audiences but that he was constantly the chief actor of interest. So I arranged with him to appear in a special play at the end of Miss Dauvray's season.

On looking over some manuscripts he owned, which had been left by his father, I found one

that appeared attractive. It was called Trade. It was a story about a rich young auctioneer and his love for a titled young lady and, as in most English plays up to the period, "caste" was the dramatic theme. I changed the title of the play to The Highest Bidder, and produced it at the end of Miss Dauvray's season, hoping to keep the theatre open a few weeks longer before the summer closing.

I had engaged Mr. Belasco at an earlier period to become the stage manager of the Madison Square Theatre, where I had been the business director, and I brought him over to the Lyceum with me.

Mr. Belasco, up to the time I engaged him, had been in San Francisco where, at the Baldwin Theatre, he was prompter, actor, stage manager and author. It has been said of him that he could make a play out of a "synopsis of scenes" from playbills. In his work he showed the same intense earnestness that he does now. He was young, ambitious, always industrious, and very

hot-tempered. Once, in a fit of rage, he brought his fist down with much violence on an iron safe. He rehearsed with one hand for some days afterward. He had always a keen instinct for discovering the dramatic sense of a story or a manuscript.

At the Lyceum, Belasco went zealously to work to get The Highest Bidder ready for rehearsals. The rehearsals did not seem to promise well, but the first night removed all our doubts. It leaped into instant favour, as the showbills say. Sothern was then, as now, fond of rehearsals. At his request I used to sit, at night, after the regular performance, in the silent auditorium and watch his effects on the stage. His development of a character was made up of a large number of little artistic details. He never trusted to chance. Every effect was carefully considered and rehearsed. During the first week of our play we watched carefully the performances and the business at the box-office.

One evening during that week we were dining

E. H. SOTHERN WITH H. C. DE MILLE AND DAVID BELASCO
authors of Lord Chumley. The authors arranging a scene at rehearsal

at the old Ashland House, which was located just across from the theatre. Sothern looked across at the playhouse and, pointing excitedly, said: "Look! Isn't it bully? There's a speculator in front!" Sure enough, there was a "hawker" intercepting buyers with his offers. It was a significant sign. We felt that success was sure. These birds of prey always anticipated theatrical successes then, as they do sometimes now. A few weeks later, when we were playing to crowded houses, Sothern asked, one night: "Can anything be done to stop those infernal speculators?"

CHAPTER TWO

SOTHERN AND THE HIGHEST BIDDER

I HOPE I may be pardoned if I dilate a little on my first play, The Highest Bidder. When I first read the work I was delighted with it. Then began rehearsals, revisions and alterations, for plays, as we have been told, are "not written, but rewritten." As the rehearsals became more and more thorough, however, I felt apprehensive. The end of an important act, the third, seemed ineffective. So, at the dress rehearsal, I invited about a dozen intimate friends to be present, hoping to secure a little comfort from their approval. The play was acted at this rehearsal with much animation before the gloomy, darkened auditorium. Belasco had goaded the actors into giving a spirited performance; but the results appeared tame. Nor could I glean a ray of comfort out of this

oppressive gloom from my friends. They sat unmoved and, though apparently interested, they remained unaffected by the comedy situations. I concealed my chagrin from Sothern and the company. I felt that a first-night failure was impending, and so I approached the event with becoming fortitude. On the opening night the strains of the orchestra, before the curtain rose, seemed in my ears our funeral dirge. There was a large and an expectant audience. The curtain rose. The play proceeded. Sothern and that old favourite Mr. Le Moyne received a cordial welcome. Their scenes — in fact, all the scenes in the first three acts — were received with delight. "But," I thought, "wait until we fall down at the end of our third-act climax!" I watched from an unobserved corner. The act proceeded, and when Sothern came forward in the well-developed series of incidents that led to the crowning situation, and answered Mr. Le Moyne's vociferous question, "Then who has bought the Larches?" with two words, "I did!" the applause was deaf-

ening. There were seven genuine curtain calls; and seven calls in that little house meant more than the frantic excitement evoked nowadays when thirty calls are supposed to gauge conviction from the pent-up excitement of an audience. And this had been the climax about which I had felt uncertain! But, as I explained the matter to myself afterward, I had become accustomed to the scene at rehearsals; and my little improvised audience in a darkened auditorium, self-conscious and not seated among an eager, throbbing crowd, was unable to feel or judge under such dispiriting conditions, and so was rendered undemonstrative.

Since that day I have never invited an audience to a dress rehearsal. In judging a play a manager should remember his first impression of a manuscript and stick to it. His second reading and the repetition of the scenes at rehearsals have removed from his sense the elements of surprise, suspense and anticipation. Yet no one manager's opinion of a manuscript represents any general standard

of a play's merits or demerits. It is purely a personal predilection. What one man may decline another may fancy. I have at times been accused of declining several "successes." Many such plays, declined at first and subsequently produced by some one else, carry with them a tale of revisions, of fundamental and organic alterations and improvements that, owing to these declinations and the reasons therefor, have changed sometimes the entire ethical and dramatic aspect of the works. The play thus finally produced is a far different proposition from the defective work first offered.

To return to the Lyceum: We felt very proud over the success of our first theatrical venture. Mr. Sothern was, however, unfortunately for me, engaged for the following season to Miss Dauvray, who refused to release him. On the payment of a handsome bonus she agreed to cancel his contract and I secured him. Our play ran far into the hot weather and his road tour was arranged. In preparing the printing I

made ample display of the name of my young star. One afternoon he came rushing to my office. He had seen his name in large letters on a fence on Broadway.

"I say, D. F.," he said, "you know I'll never be able to live up to those big letters." I assured him that the letters were not too large, and if he thought they were he'd have to work up to them and make the public agree with my view. That tour was a great success. Sothern continued under my management for many years.

When we approached our fiftieth night at the Lyceum with The Highest Bidder I felt we ought to have a souvenir. These offerings were then in vogue for long runs. We felt that fifty nights in the summer was a long run — for us. Mr. Sothern had begun life as a draughtsman; so he agreed to make the drawings of the characters in our play, and they were embodied in a neat brochure and presented to the audience. In addition to this, we thought it would be a good scheme — so elated were we young fellows —

to send a copy to each of the prominent actor-folk in London.

At that time the messenger-boy service was in its infancy. I called up the head of the district office and requested him to send me a reliable boy who could be trusted with a mission to London by the next day's steamer. They sent me one of their young superintendents, Eugene B. Sanger. I gave him his instructions, which were to deliver fifty addressed souvenirs, and bring back by the same steamer the autographed receipts for each. These included Henry Irving, Forbes Robertson, Mary Anderson, Madge and W. H. Kendal, George Alexander, Beerbohm Tree, Buffalo Bill and others. The messenger afterward, possibly inoculated by a theatrical germ acquired from this experience, became an actor and was added to the cast of The Highest Bidder. He is now a prominent stage manager. Buffalo Bill treated our boy very well. He assembled his entire Wild West Show of several hundred people and had the boy photographed seated in the centre

of this picturesque group, with himself on one side and his *fidus* Achates, Major Burke, on the other. These pictures were reproduced in various papers, and the entire enterprise, owing to its novelty, received a large amount of press attention.

It is needless to say that all this contributed to the public interest in our play. Even in those days there was unique publicity. Here is another sample: One of the members of the company, an Englishman named J. W. Pigott, was an athlete and a sturdy swimmer. From a boat near the Atlantic Highlands he swam out toward an ocean liner. An officer, thinking he was exhausted, threw him a line to which was attached a life-preserver. He pushed it from him.

"What do you want?" asked the officer as the passengers gathered around.

"I want to know if you have seen The Highest Bidder." Then he dived and made for his boat in the distance.

Edwin Booth, who had been a great friend of

the elder Sothern, came one night to the Lyceum at my invitation to see the young actor after he had become a full-fledged star. After the performance, Mr. Booth, Mr. Sothern and I supped together at the Players' Club, and the great actor told us of many incidents in the career of Mr. Sothern's father. He informed us that it was due to him, Booth, that young Sothern was christened "Edward."

"It came about this way," said Mr. Booth. "When you" — addressing young Sothern — "were born in New Orleans your father telegraphed me to become your godfather, and that you were to be named Edwin — after me. Your father was a splendid and brilliant man, but rather wild in his tendencies at times, and I was a little afraid to assume the responsibility of godfather to his son; so I declined. I am sorry now. But that is why you are called Edward instead of Edwin."

Another amusing story that Mr. Booth told us that evening, which I have never seen in

print, was one referring to an experience of his own when he made his first trip to Australia. He was then a young man. With five members of his company he sailed for Melbourne, where he expected to make up the rest of his support from among the local companies. When they arrived at Honolulu it was found that the steamer would be required to remain there several days. The presence of the distinguished American actor became instantly known, and a royal command was received from King Kamehaheha to give a performance of Richard III on the following evening. Mr. Booth agreed to this, but found difficulty in assembling a supporting company. Having been told that he could secure local amateur talent, he soon had a company assembled. The best he could do, without jeopardizing the other parts, for the rôle of Queen Elizabeth, was to assign that part to a Dutchman, short in stature and rather uncertain from the histrionic point of view. Mr. Booth thought that any defects in the man's capacity would be more apparent

to his own company than to his audience, and the rehearsals proceeded industriously. Mr. Booth managed everything, from the stage to the business "in front." He sent a number of natives about the streets to stick up posters, furnishing them with a local product called "poi," to be used as paste. To his amazement, however, the next morning he found that not a poster had been put out. The "poi" being an article of food, the people had absconded with the concoction and eaten it; so the great actor started out himself, with some assistants, and put up his own printing.

On the night of the performance the little theatre was crowded. The King, however, sat in royal state in the "first entrance" — on the stage — on a royal chair which had been obtained from his palace. Though the native performers afforded much amusement to Mr. Booth, the audience was held in rapt attention through the progress of the play. For the throne scene, Mr. Booth was able to borrow the royal chair

in which King Kamehaheha sat, a courtesy that His Royal Highness readily accorded. This lent local colour and great effect to the scene. At the conclusion of the performance word was sent to Mr. Booth that the King wished to see him. Mr. Booth, modest and retiring, knowing that he could not speak the local language, approached His Majesty timidly and respectfully. When he reached the King's side His Royal Highness slapped him heartily on the shoulder and said in good English:

"Booth, it was a splendid performance; I saw your father play the part twenty years ago."

CHAPTER THREE

SOME EARLY TRIUMPHS AND FIRST APPEARANCE

IT was in Lord Chumley, Sothern's second play at the Lyceum, that a famous comedian, Charles B. Bishop, appeared under my management, and during my engagement he came to his end in the rôle of the comic old father. His last words on the stage were, "O Lord!" — a part of the text. He went to his dressing-room and there the splendid old actor expired. Bishop had been in his day a very popular comedian, both as a star in modern plays and as a comedian in support of Edwin Booth and other Shakespearean stars.

He told me once of a humorous incident in his life when playing in a stock company in Baltimore, in which he was a popular favourite. In the same company was a Miss Josephine Parker, the soubrette of the company, who was also greatly

liked by her audiences. Bishop married her one day, and the news soon spread about the city. Many letters and telegrams came to the happy couple at the theatre. The manager of the company gave them the day off to celebrate their nuptials. The next evening they were to appear again, in a play — it was the day of repertoire — called, I believe, The Death of Rollo. In this drama the hero was locked in a cell for a political crime. He was supposed to be a married man, having a wife he loved and several children. His dearest friend comes to the jail in the hope of seeing him. The jailer, however, had strict orders to admit no one. The part of the jailer was played by Bishop. The friend pleads with the jailer in the name of humanity, but without avail. Then the dialogue ran something as follows:

FRIEND: Are you married?

JAILER: Yes! (A shout of laughter from the audience.)

FRIEND: Any children?

JAILER: Yes; two lovely boys.

FRIEND: Then, in the name of your wife and those children ——

The rest of the dialogue was not heard amid the tumult and laughter and applause that the significantly personal lines unconsciously called forth.

In the early days referred to in my opening paragraph Mr. Gillette was a young, quiet, thoughtful man, with a gentle manner in which lurked a constant sense of quaint and furtive humour. He had been a member of a stock company at Wood's Theatre, Cincinnati, with much work to do and very small pay. He came to the Madison Square Theatre one day in 1881, where I had made my own metropolitan début as business manager. He had met the owners of the theatre, the Mallory Brothers. He was engaged to go on tour in Bronson Howard's Young Mrs. Winthrop. He had also written a comedy called The Professor, which the Mallory Brothers afterward agreed to produce at their little playhouse, with himself in the title rôle. The play was a success, and it was then my

duty to send him on tour as a star in the company. Then a second company was formed and also sent on tour; in fact we had so many successes at the Madison Square Theatre, beginning with the famous Hazel Kirke, that many duplicate companies were formed. This was the beginning of that system of number two, three and four companies which has to this day been found popular and profitable — the companies being adapted to the section of the country and the character of the towns they had to visit. This period in Mr. Gillette's career was the beginning of a series of popular and successful plays he wrote, which, as the years went on, included adaptations like Mr. Wilkinson's Widows, Too Much Johnson, She, and orginal plays like, Held by the Enemy, Secret Service and Sherlock Holmes.

I have referred to Robert Mantell, John Mason and Viola Allen. Mr. Mantell, a young Scotch actor, came to this country in 1878, but made his first conspicuous success with Fanny Davenport as Loris Ipanoff in Fedora at the Fourteenth

Street Theatre in 1883. I engaged him at what was regarded a very large salary — ten thousand dollars for the season — to appear in my production of Called Back, at the Fifth Avenue Theatre.

John Mason had been for some years the juvenile man of the Boston Museum, and, with the exception of the veteran actor, William Warren, and the leading man, Charles Barron, whom he succeeded, no man had been more popular than young Mason. The Boston Museum Company was splendidly equipped for giving not only old comedies and modern dramas but operas as well, and Mason lays to his credit a distinct success as Grosvenor, in Gilbert and Sullivan's opera of Patience. His only appearance at the old Lyceum was in the play mentioned, Dakolar. He appeared as the leading man of my stock company when I had transferred the organization from the Lyceum to Daly's. Viola Allen came to me in the earlier days at the Madison Square Theatre, fresh from school; but, her parents being actors, she came well equipped by

study. She succeeded Annie Russell at the Madison Square Theatre in Mrs. Burnett's Esmeralda. Miss Russell herself had just escaped from a juvenile opera company and wore long dresses the first time she called on us — trying to look old enough for the juvenile part. She was immediately engaged, and when she and the company went on tour she was succeeded in her rôle by Viola Allen.

Richard Mansfield appeared at the Lyceum Theatre in 1885 with Mrs. Fiske (then Minnie Maddern) in a play called In Spite of All, for which he had been especially engaged.

I had several curious experiences with Richard Mansfield — an eccentric man, but an artist of high ideals. I had engaged him once, before the Lyceum days, when I was the business manager of the Madison Square Theatre in 1883 to play in a piece by the late Hjalmer H. Boyessen, the novelist — a play in which Marie Burroughs made her first appearance. The play had not started well with the public, and believing that

Mansfield, who was free then, might stimulate interest in the work, he was given the leading comedy rôle. But his efforts were futile, both artistically, for him, and financially for us, and the piece was soon discontinued. The failure was not due to him; it was inherent in the play. Some years later when Mansfield had become a successful star he produced Arms and the Man by Bernard Shaw. After his success, he wrote to Shaw, asking for other plays. Shaw replied that his greatest work was Candida, and that there was but one woman he knew that could play the leading female rôle. The play would cost ten per cent. (double the usual terms), and the actress would require $150.00 per week— a very good salary in those days. Mansfield wired, accepting. When the play came, with it arrived Miss Janet Achurch, an English actress, identified with Ibsen matinées, in London. Mansfield rehearsed the play, but soon discarded it — deeming it unsuited to him. Angry at the outcome, and with having made a contract

with the actress for three months, he repudiated the bargain. Knowing her, she came to me for advice. I arranged with the actor to settle her claim by a suitable payment, and she returned to England. When I met Shaw, the following summer in London, I referred to the matter. Shaw treated it as a joke. "Oh," he said, "Mansfield wanted a play. I saw a chance to sell him Candida, and to do a good turn for a deserving actress. I really had no idea he would accept the terms for either. I was not much interested in my share of the matter. Why," he said, continuing, "there is a company in our provinces now playing Arms and the Man. They do well on their opening nights. But the rest of the week they play to nearly empty houses. I wired them to send me royalties for the first night only. But they persist in paying me for every performance. Why, they can't afford it!"

I had several years previously made Shaw an offer to come to America, guaranteeing him an annual salary, with the proviso that he should

write one play a year for my company, and retain for himself the profits of any other work. To this he replied, characteristically, that the offer of such a financial certainty would so overwhelm him that he would lose his inspiration! He preferred to work in England, for less money, but under the stimulus of necessity. He could not stand wealth — then.

My next experience with Mr. Mansfield was when he and I came to an agreement, one night in Chicago, that I should become his manager — to provide him with plays, a company, etc., and that he would concern himself only with the stage and his performance. For three weeks I laboured in his behalf. He at once began to interfere so radically with every detail of my share of the work that I was forced, in spite of his remonstrance, to withdraw. But Mansfield's work for the stage was always impressive, dignified and artistic, and his death was a great loss to the higher interests of the drama.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE LYCEUM STOCK COMPANY

BEFORE the beginning of Mr. Sothern's tour as a star, I had made arrangements for assembling a permanent stock company. Belasco was the stage manager of the house and the late Henry C. De Mille was associated with me in a literary way. I asked them to collaborate and to prepare a modern society comedy for the opening of the first regular stock season. They wrote The Wife, the opening play for the company. Thus began one of the most famous of dramatic collaborations. Their method of work was unique. De Mille was the literary man. Belasco was the dramatist, though De Mille had been successful with previous dramatic work, and this experience gave him the quality to fit in with his dramatic associate.

Their plays were first constructed without dialogue. This was the most difficult part of their labours. When the framework was decided upon, the dialogue of the acting scenes began. Frequently the work was done on a silent stage, De Mille writing dialogue, Belasco acting each part and fitting the words appropriately to the scene, virtually stage-managing the literary into the dramatic form, timing the length of the scenes, entrances and exits into dramatic proportion.

On one occasion, when they had constructed the third act of their third Lyceum play — The Charity Ball — they came to me with the result. It was an effective act, only the leading lady was not in it. "But," I said, "I can't afford to leave the leading woman of my company out of the principal act of your play!" They saw this too. It meant a serious reconstruction of the entire scheme. But in a few days they had fixed upon a satisfactory solution. The story of David Copperfield's love for Dora and afterward for Agnes gave them the clew. So that, though the

hero of the play was in love with the lady they had fixed upon, it was easy to bring the character analogous to Agnes into the ethical scheme and corresponding limelight.

When we first began at the Lyceum, I gave them a list of my company and they started to work enthusiastically. The Wife was the first result. It was produced on November 1, 1887, and inaugurated the beginning of the Lyceum Theatre's career as a home for the stock company. The members of the first company were Herbert Kelcey, Henry Miller, Nelson Wheatcroft, W. J. Le Moyne, Charles S. Dickson, Charles Walcot, Walter C. Bellows, Georgia Cayvan, Grace Henderson, Louise Dillon, Vida Croly, Mrs. Thomas Whiffen, Mrs. Charles Walcot and William Faversham.

Faversham was understudy for Henry Miller, but he was so young and boyish, despite his earnestness, that on one occasion, when he played Miller's part in The Wife for a week, the situation of the two actresses in the play,

Walter Bellows (at top). At right and down: William Faversham, Mrs. Walcot, Mr. Walcot, Nelson Wheatcroft, H. C. De Mille, Henrietta Crosman, Vida Croly, David Belasco, Henry Miller, W. J. Le Moyne. Mrs. Whiffen, Charles Dickson. In centre: Grace Henderson, Georgia Cayvan, Herbert Kelcey, Louise Dillon.

who were striving for his affections, was made rather incredible in their contest by his youth.

Later other additions to my company included Effie Shannon, Henrietta Crosman, Cyril Scott, Edward J. Morgan, Felix Morris, Elizabeth Tyree, Katherine Florence, Grace Elliston, and afterward, through shifting conditions, came Mary Mannering, Hilda Spong, Julie Opp, Ethel Hornick, James K. Hackett — who succeeded Kelcey as leading man — and May Robson. Mr. Kelcey has starred in various plays. Henry Miller became not only a star but what is called an "actor manager." Nelson Wheatcroft, an admirable actor, was a star in one of his own plays; he died, however, before he reached the full zenith of his career. Mr. Le Moyne, though never a star technically, was the best actor of this period in rôles of eccentric old men. Charles S. Dickson has starred as an actor and is famed as an author of plays and operas. Miss Georgia Cayvan became established as a star after she withdrew from the company, but illness, succeeded by death,

came untimely in her progress. "Dear Mrs. Whiffen," as she has been known in the profession, was with me when I began as a manager at the Madison Square Theatre in 1879, and is still playing in one of Charles Frohman's companies. Mr. Faversham, after leaving my company, became the second and then the first actor of the Empire Theatre Company, from which he has emerged as a star in conjunction with a former member of my company, Julie Opp, whom he married. Mary Mannering, Hilda Spong, James K. Hackett, William A. Faversham, Henrietta Crosman, Cyril Scott and May Robson have established their orbits also in the theatrical planetary system. L. Wagenhals, of the firm of Wagenhals & Kemper, managers, began his career as leading man in one of my small companies, in which Maude Odell, now a prominent actress, played the leading female rôle. After several years as an actor he became, as he now is, one of the most successful managers of the day.

Our first play, The Wife, was not the success

on the first night that we had expected. The press, though it lauded the company, found the play good only in parts. The authors, however, set to work and by excisions and revisions got the work into more attractive shape. The first two acts were condensed into one. Mr. Le Moyne, who had the part of a lame war veteran who limped slowly through the play, was deprived of his wound, and was thus accelerated into more physical animation. His scenes, like his "game" leg, ceased to drag; so the play got a fresh start and ran through my first season.

This play, being my first with my new stock company, was carefully nursed and worked by every legitimate process. My old friend, the late S. S. Packard, of Packard's Business College, bought three hundred seats as a Christmas present to his pupils. The effect of their attendance and their genuine and undisguised enthusiasm was a great help in mending the fortunes of the improved work, and in drawing attention to its renewed merits. The play ran a year at the Lyceum.

On another occasion I took advantage of a speech made by Chauncey Depew, utilizing in my own behalf his observations on another play. It was on the occasion of the one hundredth performance of Bronson Howard's The Henrietta, with Robson and Crane. These actors celebrated the event by a banquet. One of the speakers was Mr. Depew who, with characteristic good will and eloquence, lauded The Henrietta, and its success. He extolled the splendid work of the author and indulged in some pregnant remarks about the great American drama and its dominance. I selected an impersonal paragraph from his patriotic speech which referred to the American drama and quoted him liberally in all my advertisements of The Wife, to the humorous amazement of Messrs. Robson and Crane, who had made nothing of the opportunity. A few nights after this, I met Mr. Depew, for the first time, at a supper given by the late Bronson Howard to Sir — then Mr. — Charles Wyndham. When I was in-



HENRY MILLER, HERBERT KELCEY, AND NELSON WHEATCROFT
in The Wife

troduced to the distinguished publicist and orator he said:

"Oh, Frohman! You're the manager of the Lyceum Theatre, are you?"

I assented to the impeachment. Then he told the guests the story of his hypothecated speech — that Robson and Crane, at a very great expense, had given a great banquet to celebrate their play; that he delivered an appropriate speech on this occasion, and that I had feloniously arrogated and appropriated for my play, in my advertisements of The Wife, remarks which had been maliciously diverted from their object.

"And," continued Mr. Depew, "when some of my relatives came to town in search of theatrical entertainment and read these advertisements, they naturally went to the Lyceum play that I had apparently commended. The next day," added Mr. Depew, with a twinkle in his eye, "they said: 'Uncle Chauncey, we saw The Wife, and you know you ought to be very careful what you commend!' "

Bronson Howard's play, One of Our Girls, was produced with Helen Dauvray as a star in the old Lyceum Theatre in 1885. Mr. Howard later wrote a second play for this star at the Lyceum, entitled Met by Chance. The play was a failure, and no one realized this more quickly than the amiable author himself.

Shortly after the failure of Met by Chance, Mr. Howard told of a visit to him by Robson and Crane, the well known comedians. When their cards were brought up he felt they had come to abrogate their contract with him, discouraged possibly by the failure of Met by Chance; but when they came, elated into his presence, they said, if Met by Chance had been a success they would not have been so enthusiastic about his forthcoming work; but since it had failed they came to assure him of their faith in his next play, because they felt that an author so expert and capable could not, by the law of chance, write two failures in succession! This proved to be the case. The next play was The Henrietta. It was one of the

greatest successes for Robson and Crane, and for Mr. Howard, the author.

In One of Our Girls, Mr. F. F. Mackay enacted the rôle of a suave French swell who, having deliberately insulted the American girl with whom an English officer — played by Mr. Sothern — was in love, thus brings forward one of the chief situations of the play. In this situation the English officer steps forward deliberately and, looking the Frenchman in the eye, takes off his glove and slaps him viciously in the face. Mr. Mackay has told me how faithful a study he had made of the character of the Frenchman. In this scene Mr. Howard wished him to become violent and furious, in accordance with the popular notion of an excitable Frenchman's character. Mr. Mackay argued that the French count, having been shown in the play to be an expert duellist both with the rapier and the pistol, and having faced danger frequently, was not liable to lose control of himself. Mr. Howard readily saw the point. The result was one of the most

striking situations we have in the American drama; for the Frenchman received the insult without the movement of a muscle. He stood rigid. Only a flash of the eye for an instant revealed his emotion. Then the audience saw his face grow red, and then pale. This was followed by the quiet announcement from the count that he would send his seconds to the Englishman. This exhibition of facial emotion betrayed by the visible rush of blood to the actor's face was frequently noted at the time. It was a muscular trick, Mr. Mackay told me. He put on a tight collar for that scene and strained his neck against it until the blood came, and when he released the pressure, and the blood receded, the effect was reached. It was a splendid moment, and it is one of the many effects that have been studied out during the progress and development of a play during rehearsals.

In many of the plays that I produced at the old Lyceum Theatre, many significant bits of business and many important situations were

HILDA SPONG
First appearance in America

MAY ROBSON
in Lady Bountiful, by Pinero

brought about purely by accident. Sometimes the actor or actress would apologize for what appeared to be a bit of stupidity or neglect, but it was generally found that just such episodes might naturally take place in real life, and so they were incorporated in the structure of the plays. That is one reason why many managers rehearse their companies in new plays with the necessary properties and furniture as well as scenery, as soon as these can be provided for them.

CHAPTER FIVE

EXPERIENCES WITH AUTHORS

BRONSON HOWARD, who has been rightfully regarded as the Dean of the American stage, was the finest man I ever knew. He had a sweet, gentle nature; a patient, philosophic disposition. When one spends every day, almost every waking hour, for two months on a European tour with a man, one comes to know him very well; and in this way I came to know and love Howard, and to esteem him as a man of rare and noble qualities. But my experience is not unique. All his friends felt for him the same affectionate comradeship. He was always keenly considerate of the feelings of others. Once I saw a friend tender him his cigar-case and say: "Here, Howard; have a cigar." He apparently accepted, in appreciation of the courtesy; then, handing it back, he said:

"I guess it's a little too strong for me. If you don't mind I'll smoke one of my mild ones." He had had no intention of accepting it. He always preferred his milder brand; but an abrupt refusal might have seemed discourteous, and this suggestion of acceptance made the donor feel that he really had conferred a courtesy. Such acts as these show a phase of the great dramatist's simple nature. During his lifetime he was the president of the Dramatists' Club, which he founded and to which he bequeathed his valuable library. His plays were the genuine, typical plays of American life.

Howard talked with me frequently of his work and his methods. He was an inveterate smoker of mild cigars. What he called "the smoking stage" of a play, under incubation, was the construction period — that stage in which an author materializes in his mind all the active events and incidents of a drama, to get it into a symmetrical framework; exactly as a building is constructed, with foundation, girders, beams and

floors, until the naked structure is completed. Then comes the dialogue which, as in the building, is again analogous to the upholstery and decoration of the rooms. That is the only way to construct a play. Many suppose a play is a matter of story-writing, telling about people and things in a series of conversations. That is why so many literary men fail as dramatists, while many successful dramatists might fail to score in efforts at formal rhetoric.

Conversation is the bane of drama. Dialogue is the chief attribute — dialogue in which the action is carried forward or developed. The simplicity and brevity of the spoken words admit of the exhibition of scenes of dramatic action or movement, or the revelation of character. Long speeches may be intensely dramatic or short ones dull. In Hamlet we actually see the ghost, and we see the tremendous impressiveness of the scene in which the son vows to avenge his father's murder. But the scene could easily have been told by the inexpert writer in a few

W. J. Le MOYNE AND MRS. CHARLES WALCOT
in a scene from The Wife

conversations, thence leading the audience on to the action following Hamlet's resolve. All that is reasonably possible should be visualized. So Howard's chief labours were concerned with that period of intellectual gestation during which he devoted himself to the consumption of multitudes of mild cigars. His Banker's Daughter, Saratoga, and The Henrietta were all produced in London, where Howard was as well known as he was in New York. He made a fortune out of his royalties at a time when the possibilities were not so great as they are to-day, when the author of a successful play can reach a safe harbour for life.

A quarter of a century ago Bartley Campbell, the dramatist, had struggled a long time to acquire a competence by dramatic work. He was inspired to renewed ambition by an incident that is told of him. One day he was being driven by a friend along the principal avenue in Long Branch, then our principal coast resort. Various beautiful residences were pointed out to him.

"Who lives there?" he asked, pointing to a stately mansion.

"Maggie Mitchell, the actress," was the reply.

"And who lives there?"

"Mary Anderson."

"And who lives in that gorgeous place?"

"John Albaugh, the actor and manager."

And so the homes of various well-to-do Thespians were shown him.

"And where do the authors live?" he asked.

"Oh, they live in New York or on some farm."

"Ah!" he said, and he began to think deeply.

The following year he was being driven about Paris, and again the homes of prominent theatrical people were shown him. One splendid mansion was owned by Victorien Sardou, another by Alexander Dumas, another by Edouard Pailleron, another by Georges Ohnet, and others by various dramatists and writers.

"But where are the homes of the great actors?"

"Oh, they live in apartments!"

Here he saw how safeguarded were the oppor-

ELSIE LESLIE
in The Prince and the Pauper

tunities for authors. So he began afresh, on his return to America, to write and also to manage his own plays. He vowed that as an author he would try to equal the prosperity of the actor. And he did. But the present age is generous to the dramatic author, and, amid so much competitive management, chances for the new writers are multifarious and munificent. Clyde Fitch, Augustus Thomas, Charles Klein, William Gillette and others have all made fortunes from their plays, and new authors are crowding forward successfully for the golden reward.

Once, at the Lyceum, I came near producing a play by Mark Twain. He had in years past written for the stage. He was the author of Colonel Sellers, in which John T. Raymond made a fortune. The famous catch phrase "There's millions in it!" came from this character. Mark Twain wrote the play in conjunction with Charles Dudley Warner. But curiously enough, Colonel Sellers, as John T. Raymond interpreted the character, was not at all intended by the author

as a comic personage. Twain had drawn the rôle from the eccentric traits of a relative of his — an idealist, and a solemn, serious man. He originally designed the rôle for Edwin Booth! The tragedian, however, failed to see himself in the part, and it fell into Raymond's hands. In consequence of the enormous popular success of the play, because of the extravagance of Raymond's interpretation although it was rightfully a legitimate caricature of a type of American, Mark Twain did not interpose; but he always claimed that Raymond's, "Sellers" was not his "Sellers."

The play I refer to was one he wrote in conjunction with W. D. Howells, called The American Claimant, which was to be produced at the Lyceum in 1886 by A. P. Burbank, a popular lecture platform entertainer. Having read the play, I rented the Lyceum for a few weeks, before my regular season, to Mr. Clemens. The piece was full of humour. The hero was an inventor. One of his inventions was a fire-extinguisher.

With this machine he makes his first entrance on the stage, and with it almost sets fire to the apartment. Rehearsals showed that the work was not likely to prove successful, and after some litigious correspondence between Mr. Clemens and myself I arranged to accept a suitable financial solatium for the time the withdrawal of the piece left vacant.

My next play by this author was The Prince and the Pauper, adapted from his story by the late Abby Sage Richardson. I produced this at the Broadway Theatre in January, 1890, with Elsie Leslie in the double rôle of Prince and Pauper. Later on, Fanny Ward, now a well-known London and New York actress, was Miss Leslie's understudy. Mr. Clemens made a humorous speech on the first night, highly commending the work; but later he sent me a new manuscript of the play, rewritten in his own way, though following Mrs. Richardson's construction. Though Mr. Clemens's work was admirable, it was not so suited to acting require-

ments as the adaptation I was using; so I returned it to the author with my very adequate but, to him, unconvincing reasons for its rejection. After that I became embroiled in a lawsuit, because it transpired in court that Mr. Clemens had yielded the rights of adaptation some time before to Edward H. House, the predecessor of William Winter as dramatic critic of the *Tribune*. Though we wrangled in court on the subject and upon the issue that I should be compelled to pay double royalties — to both Mr. Clemens and Mr. House — Mr. Clemens and I played our nightly games of pool at The Players with unruffled amity. I lost the case, though Judge Joseph Daly, brother of Augustin, tendered me the doubtful consolation that I was morally right, though enmeshed legally. The suit was continued; but, on the breaking up of Mr. Clemens's publishing firm, I withdrew it.

Mr. Howells, like most literary men, had also essayed stage work, but, as in the case of Tenny-

W. J. Le MOYNE, MRS. WHIFFEN, HERBERT KELCEY, HENRY MILLER, AND GEORGIA CAYVAN
in Sweet Lavender

son and others, doubtless found it an art too foreign to his methods. Many of Mr. Howells's short conversational comedies have capital dialogue, and I have produced several of them, The Mousetrap being particularly effective.

CHAPTER SIX

THE PINERO PLAYS AT THE LYCEUM

ONE of my early plays was Pinero's Sweet Lavender. It was first given in November, 1888, and, oddly, the only American character in the play was enacted by the only Englishman in my company — Mr. Kelcey. In the cast were W. J. Le Moyne, Henry Miller, Georgia Cayvan, Mrs. Whiffen, Louise Dillon.

In those days the audiences were far more unsophisticated and fastidious as to their dramatic subjects. The first-night patrons were startled to find that the heroine was an illegitimate child. It seemed to cast a pall upon the assemblage. I felt it and saw the reason. I cabled the author for permission to make a slight change in the relations of the parents. He grudgingly consented, and deprecated the attitude of the public

mind on the subject. But the success of the play was at stake; and as a result of my revision it ran a season. It was subsequently played on tour with two companies.

A little reflection on the character of the audiences of 1887 and of present-day theatre-goers will show how the public's acceptance of plays has changed. When I revived this play a few years later I produced it as originally written, and there was not a ripple of objection. My experience with The Second Mrs. Tanqueray was similar. When Mr. Pinero sent me the manuscript I wrote him I did not dare present so frank a play in the evening bill, but that I would like to produce so fine a work at a series of special matinées. To this Mr. Pinero agreed, saying that George Alexander, in London, had the same scruples, and the play was also to be tried at the St. James Theatre at a series of afternoon performances. It happened that a play called Liberty Hall was then running at the St. James. The author of this play objected to

the matinées of a work by so distinguished an author as Pinero, while his own drama still held the stage, and so it was subsequently placed in the evening bill.

This play gave Mrs. Pat Campbell her first London success. Mr. Pinero had witnessed her performance some time previously in a melodrama at the Adelphi, and selected her for the principal rôle in this, his greatest serious work. It laid the foundation of Mrs. Campbell's successful future. I did not give the proposed matinées of this work at the Lyceum, but later presented it in this country with Mr. and Mrs. Kendal, when they were under my management, to whom I ceded my rights to the play. It was then regarded as exceedingly strong meat. The play was a great success, despite the disfavour with which the theme was greeted. Now it would seem no stronger than a nursery tale, when compared to some of the subjects of the plays of 1909-10. Many plays followed from year to year at the Lyceum, where I alternated the

appearance of Mr. Sothern with my regular company. While one organization was on tour the other held the boards at the Lyceum.

My experience with Mr. Pinero, both as an author and as a friend, has always been delightful. For many years he gave me the rights to all his plays. We had no contract, only a memorandum of terms; and no offers of greater financial inducements have swerved him from his allegiance. The successes at the Lyceum, with the splendid casts with which I was enabled to equip his plays, pleased him far more in respect to their artistic performance than the monetary returns, which were usually munificent. Some of the plays obtained larger runs through the appropriate casts than they might have otherwise obtained. For, while they were all works that bore the significant hallmark of brilliant literary and dramatic accomplishment, they were not always suitable in theme for very long, popular runs. Among the plays of Pinero, after Sweet Lavender, were Lady Bountiful, The Amazons,

The Princess and the Butterfly, Trelawny of the Wells, and The Benefit of the Doubt.

The casts for all these plays are memorable. Lady Bountiful was first given in London at the Garrick Theatre with John Hare, Forbes Robertson and Kate Rorke. Mr. Hare was the lessee of the theatre and the star of the performance. Mr. Le Moyne, in my company, enacted the same rôle here. Herbert Kelcey and Georgia Cayvan played the two other rôles. Miss May Robson, then a member of the company, made a distinct hit as a type of a London slavey. Mr. Walcot, Mrs. Whiffen, Charles Harbury, Effie Shannon, Bessie Tyree, Fritz Williams, Augustus Cook, Walter Bellows and John Findlay completed the cast.

One of the most remarkable of the Pinero casts was that with which I was able to give his The Princess and the Butterfly. Mr. Pinero had little faith in this play as an American moneymaker, but, acted as it was at the Lyceum, it ran nine or ten weeks — as long as it did at

JAMES K. HACKETT AND MARY MANNERING
in The Princess and the Butterfly, by Pinero

the St. James Theatre, London. The dramatic value of the performance as reflected by the players may be judged by the list of characters in the play. They formed my company for that year. The men included James K. Hackett, Edward J. Morgan, Felix Morris, Charles Walcot, William Courtleigh, Frank Mills, John Findlay. The women were Mary Mannering, Julie Opp, Mrs. Whiffen, Katharine Florence, Bessie Tyree, Mrs. Walcot, Alison Skipworth. These were the principals of a cast that was large and of the most marked capacity. It was a five-act play, and the fourth act is one of the finest and most appealing of the earlier serious plays by this distinguished author.

In New York and in Chicago the company with this play made an equally profound impression; and at the end of the first week the principal local managers of that city gave the company a banquet, and invited the critics to meet the Lyceum actors. But Boston gave us an indifferent hearing, for tastes in different cities vary. The

so-called intellectual drama does not always thrive prosperously in so-called purely intellectual centres. Sir Henry Irving once told me that his Faust had much greater success in Philadelphia than in any other city in this country outside of New York. When I produced The Dancing Girl, Henry Arthur Jones's powerful drama, it drew more money to the box-office in Philadelphia than it did elsewhere outside of the metropolis, and had quick orders for a return visit. It seemed strange that, in a city that reflected the moral tone as strongly as did Philadelphia, plays of unsanctified love should find such popular acceptance. This has been shown, even in these days, by the success in that city of plays lighter in character but more obviously vulgar in their moral tone. In San Francisco, where one might suppose a play like The Second Mrs. Tanqueray would find great favour, that work fell flat. The explanation was that the play carried no illusion for the Golden Gate audiences. The city — it was explained — was full of Mrs.

HILDA SPONG
in Trelawny of The Wells

Tanquerays then, and the play seemed to be too much of a moral indictment to find favour as a superb realistic drama.

In Trelawny of the Wells Mr. Pinero created one of the finest comedies of his career, and the cast at the Lyceum was so eminently fitted and so thoroughly capable that both the play and the company are still favourably remembered as a superb achievement. It was regarded as superior in its *ensemble* to the London company. Mr. Pinero explained this to me by saying that, in contrast to my concrete organization, he had to do the best he could in the midst of a London season with such material as he could then gather; though unquestionably several of his actors gave admirable performances. The memory of Mary Mannering's beautiful and sympathetic performance of Rose Trelawny is still keen, while Hilda Spong, in the exuberant and ebullient Imogen Parrott, made, at her début in this country, the success of her American career.

Miss Spong earned her stage laurels in Australia. I had seen an announcement that this actress was soon to appear in London. I watched the reports of her progress, and when I went to London I saw and engaged her for my company. Her other conspicuous successes in my company were in Wheels Within Wheels and Lady Huntworth's Experiment, both by the well-known English author, R. C. Carton. Miss Spong is now a star in this country and has made America her home. In Trelawny of the Wells Mr. Walcot was the old Chancellor, E. J. Morgan was Tom Wrench, the dramatist, William Courtleigh an ambitious though unappreciated Thespian, Bessie Tyree the humorous and piquant Avonia. George C. Boniface and Mrs. Walcot were the two old actors whose days of usefulness in the play were passing, Ethel Hornick, now the wife of Dr. William Wallace Walker, of this city, enacted the old Chancellor's sister, Grant Stewart enacted the rôle of the stage manager of the Bagnigge Wells theatre,

and Mrs. Whiffen, Charles Butler and John Findlay appeared in admirable character parts. Harry Woodruff, now a star, was the bashful lord. This completed a cast that won laurels for the company.

Several years later, when near the end of the season at Daly's, I revived the play for three nights as a "farewell" to Mary Mannering, who was to leave my company shortly to assume stellar honours the following year under another management. The last night drew, for this occasion, a large audience. When, during the supper scene in act one, Rose makes her farewell speech to the members of the Bagnigge Wells company, and she has to say: "Well, I know I shall dream of you often; and if you send for me I'll come behind the curtain to you, and sit with you and talk of bygone times — these times that end to-night," and so on, the tears ran down her cheeks, and the immediate finish of the act saved her from a complete collapse. It was a real farewell to us.

Mr. Pinero's plays were always sent to me in printed book form — "printed privately." These plays were not issued to the public until a year after their performance in this country, owing to the depredations of the Western play pirates, brought about by the meagre and difficult protection the copyright laws afforded managers. These laws have since been amended. Pinero's plays came with printed stage instructions for the movement and situations developed by the dialogue, which were so complete and thorough in detail that it was not difficult to rehearse them from the author's point of view. In The Amazons, for instance, the play was so surcharged with "business" that one-half of the humorous effect lay in the inter-related action of the characters.

The last act was as elaborate as a pantomime. It represented a gymnasium. The three girls — Miss Cayvan, Miss Florence and Miss Tyree — had been brought up by their erratic mother — Mrs. Walcot — as boys. In this act there was

A SCENE FROM PINERO'S TRELAWNY OF THE WELLS

(Ethel Hornick, Charles Walcot, Mary Mannering, Bessie Tyree, E. J. Morgan, William Courtleigh and Charles W. Butler)

a complete gymnasium outfit, and for a few minutes nothing was spoken on the stage. It was all action of a diversified and humorous character. Then entered the men, Herbert Kelcey, Fritz Williams and Ferdinand Gottschalk, (whose Lord Tweenways was a graphic study of a weak scion of a noble family) and their advent culminated in a general and uproarious lark, finally broken in upon by the sudden appearance of the amazed and maddened mother. I sent the three actresses to a gymnasium to secure professional hints and practice in these "stunts." Miss Cayvan's Indian-club exercises were so proficient and expert that she received many rounds of applause during their brief exhibition. All these instructions were carefully embodied in Pinero's text, and so elaborated that they disclosed how much studious attention the author gave to his "business" as well as to his text.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE HENRY ARTHUR JONES PLAYS AND OTHERS

I PRODUCED very few plays from the French at the Lyceum, but I had two from Sardou. Their American careers were both surprises to him. The one he thought would fail proved a great success; the other, which he felt would prove popular, was an instant failure. The successful one I renamed Americans Abroad. I had read the play and purchased it for the Lyceum Company. The other, A Woman's Silence, did not meet with the expected approval. It was in this play that Georgia Cayvan appeared for the last time at the Lyceum.

Sardou gave me personally some idea of the characterization of the parts in his plays, and he was a very good actor at these impromptu per-



SKETCH OF A SCENE IN AMERICANS ABROAD
by Sardou, with his instructions

formances. One day, while I was walking along a street with him in Paris, he stopped at a stationer's and bought a package of writing-paper and pens.

"Here," he said, "is all I need for my stock in trade — paper and pens — while you Americans have to spend vast sums to build theatres."

"But," said I, "we have a little story of a man in America, who went to a lawyer for a few minutes' advice. When the lawyer presented him a large bill for this service the man said: 'What! — that big sum for ten minutes' advice!'

"'Yes,' said the lawyer; 'what I was enabled to tell you in ten minutes took me thirty years to acquire.'"

To Sardou's surprise Americans Abroad ran nearly through the season in New York, and he expressed to me his deepest gratification over this result.

Not so with his other play, A Woman's Silence, which came later. When I speedily withdrew it, after its failure, he wrote angrily

and disappointedly, feeling that I had possibly not cast the play properly. He said: "This play will be done soon in Paris with a company of actors!" The play was never given in France. I sold it to Comyns Carr, in London, who produced it somewhat modified in treatment but with equally disappointing results.

Sardou's manuscripts were remarkably lucid in their stage exposition. Every movement and situation, the location of every piece of furniture and "prop," was delineated by him with carefully written directions. In the manuscript of one of his plays an artist had been employed to make a pen-and-ink drawing of the principal stage scene. At the bottom of the drawing Sardou penciled the following: "Pay no attention to this scene. The fellow thinks he is an artist. He is not an artist." Then followed his own written descriptions of the scene and its details, which were to be followed by our scenic artist.

One of the best comedies written by Henry Arthur Jones was The Case of Rebellious Susan,

WALTER HALE AND ISABEL IRVING
in The Case of Rebellious Susan

which I produced at the Lyceum. It was the first of Mr. Jones's sociological comedies. In this play Isabel Irving made one of the most gratifying successes of her career. Walter Hale, Stephen Grattan and Rhoda Cameron made their first appearances with the company in this comedy. Mr. Jones's plays always gave splendid opportunities for acting. Though never an actor himself, as Pinero, Jerome, Carton, Esmond and other authors were, he had a keen, sympathetic sense of the theatre, and whether in comedy or in drama the actors of his plays were always able to score.

I first met Mr. Jones in his early struggling days in London. I read there his first play, or one of his earliest. It was called Saints and Sinners, and was produced at the Madison Square. This he followed with The Silver King, a great moral study in conscience and doubtless his greatest work. Mr. Jones is always a serious, thoughtful man, though he has his humorous moments. He has always shown Americans,

and especially American actors, a generous hospitality in England, and some of his dinners and luncheons given to American authors and managers are yet pleasantly remembered. He has made addresses on the drama, in American colleges and in England, and has written numerous important works on the theatre.

My first of the Henry Arthur Jones plays was The Dancing Girl. The production of this play was a significant event in Sothern's career. Mr. Sothern had previously been identified with comic rôles. This was a profoundly serious one and he hesitated a long time — in doubt as to whether the public would receive him as the serious and profligate Duke of Guisebury. He had come to the crossroads in his career. The question was, whether he should abandon comic rôles and essay serious characters or remain always a comedian. I was strong for the new departure; but, then, I had already invested five thousand dollars in the play. He finally decided favourably. He was most successful in this piece, and

with his success as the dissolute duke came the foundation of his future purpose, of which Hamlet was the goal — a goal which has always been the hope of every actor who has gained the public's approval.

One of the frequenters of the fifty-cent gallery of the old Lyceum was James K. Hackett, who came to the matinées after his "school was out." He was a student at the City College, across the way from our playhouse. He told me afterward that he often looked down from his lofty perch on the triumphant work of "Young Sothern," and hoped the day might come when he could disport himself on that stage as a real Thespian. The time did come, as he not only succeeded Sothern there as the second Prisoner of Zenda but became the leading man of my stock company later. The Prisoner of Zenda was one of the greatest romantic plays of the period. I had read the book casually, and a fortnight afterward had secured the acting rights from Anthony Hope. Mr. Sothern never gave a finer impersonation of

any rôle than he did of the Red Elphberg. When I sent him on tour I continued the play at the Lyceum with my stock company, with Hackett as the Ruritanian hero. The tricky changes of costume and beard required for the many transformations were numerous. While Sothern was playing Zenda in Boston I sent Hackett to him to spend a week in Sothern's dressing room, studying these difficulties. Mr. Sothern gave Mr. Hackett all the necessary facilities to enable him to perform these arduous changes. "The only time I have to rest in this play," said Sothern, "is when I am acting on the stage. When I am in the wings or in my dressing-room it is quick and exciting work — to change and appear again, quite calmly, in the scene."

Another play of Anthony Hope's I came by quite curiously. It was The Adventure of Lady Ursula. Mr. Hope was delivering a series of readings at the Lyceum when he handed me a manuscript play. "I wish you would look it over," he said. "They tell me in London it

is not of much account." I read it, and the next morning, to his surprise, I told him it was not only a very good play, but that I would produce it with Mr. Sothern in Philadelphia within six weeks. I did so. When I showed Mr. Hope the glowing press criticisms of its first performance he was amazed, but pleased. Curiously, the actress for whom it was written in London, who had declined it, afterward played the leading female rôle in the play for a year in the English metropolis, in Charles Frohman's company of the Duke of York's Theatre.

Mr. Hackett afterward appeared as a star under my management in The Pride of Jennico. This was a play I had purchased from Agnes and Egerton Castle, the English novelists, who had dramatized it from their story. I found their adaptation so unsuitable that I sought and obtained their permission to have my own version made. This, by the late Abby Sage Richardson, was a great success, and established Hackett's career as a star. His leading lady was a young

girl who had studied for the stage, and who had previously exhibited great possibilities. This was Bertha Galland. Her success in the play was quite as pronounced as Hackett's, and a year later she became a star under my management, appearing in The Forest Lovers, first at the Lyceum, then on tour, subsequently starring in my Notre Dame production.

Miss Maude Adams made her first appearance at the Lyceum Theatre, in Lord Chumley with Mr. Sothern in 1889. I recall her then as a very young, slight, fair-haired girl. She had come from California. She had played children's parts, but being able to wear long dresses she came East with her mother to seek her fortune on this side of the continent. Miss Adams was cast for the second rôle, and even then gave evidence of the power and charm she had to move an audience. At the conclusion of the New York engagement I loaned her to the late Charles H. Hoyt to play in The Midnight Bell at the Bijou Theatre, as my contract with

JAMES K. HACKETT AND BERTHA GALLAND
in The Pride of Jennico, adapted by Abby Sage Richardson

her forbade my sending her on tour. Meanwhile my brother, Charles Frohman, engaged her for his new stock company, then located at the old Twenty-third Street Theatre. She appeared there first in The Lost Paradise, by H. C. De Mille, and subsequently was made leading woman with John Drew. Her career with Charles Frohman was and is the most remarkable of this period.

My company continued at the Lyceum Theatre until 1899, when I secured the lease of Daly's Theatre and moved my base of operations to that famous house. The old Lyceum had been my home for fourteen years. Sothern had been under my personal management during this term, and afterward. Many plays became successful and popular during that period. Among the most successful were The Wife, Sweet Lavender, The Charity Ball, Americans Abroad, Lord Chumley, Captain Lettarblair, The Maister of Woodbarrow, Nerves, Old Heads and Young Hearts, The Dancing Girl, The Idler, The Case

of Rebellious Susan, The Prisoner of Zenda, The Princess and the Butterfly, The Amazons, and Trelawny of the Wells.

Georgia Cayvan, the leading lady of the first stock company, was successfully identified with the earlier plays. Her successor was Isabel Irving, whose Susan in The Case of Rebellious Susan was one of her best impersonations. Mary Mannering followed her. I found Miss Mannering in an English travelling company, in which, young as she was, she played the lead, while Constance Collier, now well known in this country, played the ingénue rôle. I engaged Miss Mannering immediately; and, with her mother, she came to New York to appear in her first play. This, The Courtship of Leonie, by an English author, was a failure, though Miss Mannering was enthusiastically received. Her greatest success in the company was as Rose in Trelawny of the Wells, for which play I had also engaged Hilda Spong, whom I first saw in London. Both these ladies made America their home.

HILDA SPONG, RHODA CAMERON, AND JOHN MASON
in The Ambassador, by John Oliver Hobbes (Mrs. Craigie)

In my little theatre, also, was nursed that school of acting from which emerged such future stars as the late Robert Taber — husband of Julia Marlowe — Helen Ware, Alice Fischer, George Fawcett and others, as well as these playwrights: Winchell Smith, author of Brewster's Millions and The Fortune Hunter; Bertram Harrison, an author and manager; George Foster Platt, stage manager of the New Theatre; Hugh Ford, stage manager for Liebler and Company; William De Mille, author; L. Wagenhals, manager, and others — all tutored in what was once called the Lyceum School of Acting, now the American Academy of Dramatic Arts.

CHAPTER EIGHT

SOME STARS OF THE EIGHTIES

MY FIRST stock company was composed of the most promising of the younger actors of the day. Miss Georgia Cayvan, the leading lady, was a Boston girl, who appeared first on the stage as Hebe in the Boston Ideal Company's performance of Pinafore; later she was engaged by Steele Mackaye to appear in Hazel Kirke at the Madison Square Theatre where I was employed as business manager. Herbert Kelcey, my leading man, had been a favourite in the Wallack Company when Kyrle Bellew was the leading man at that house.

Henry Miller had already acquired distinction as a *jeune premier* when he accepted the same position in my company. He was first brought to my notice in a singular way. While I was the

GEORGIA CAYVAN
Leading lady of the Lyceum Company

manager of the Madison Square Theatre I brought out at Booth's Theatre, then at Sixth Avenue and Twenty-third Street, the Greek play of Sophocles — Œdipus — in which Mr. George Riddle enacted the rôle of the King in Greek, supported by an English-speaking company. Miss Cayvan played Jocaste. I was looking for a sturdy young man to play one of the important messengers, when old C. W. Couldock, who was playing in Hazel Kirke, told me he knew of a promising young man who had played with him in Toronto, named Miller. I sent for him, but he was then otherwise engaged and could not accept. I subsequently engaged him to appear as the young lover in Bronson Howard's Young Mrs. Winthrop, which was to be put on at the Madison Square Theatre.

Mr. Faversham, who was Mr. Miller's understudy in my Lyceum Company, was then a young, handsome, immature lad, who had come to America from England and had appeared in a play that failed. Mr. Le Moyne and Mrs. Whiffen, as well as the Walcots, had also been at the Mad-

ison Square Theatre while I served there, and remained with me during the life of the old company. Mr. Le Moyne, Mrs. Walcot and Nelson Wheatcroft have since passed away. Among the younger men in the company later were Eugene Ormonde, Walter Bellows, Wilfred Buckland, Cyril Scott, Walter Hale and Fritz Williams. Mr. Scott had been playing a small rôle with Minnie Maddern. She was not then Mrs. Fiske. His salary was fifteen dollars a week. Being interested financially in the Maddern company, I observed Scott's conscientious efforts and exuberant ability, and transferred him to my stock company.

Virginia Harned was another actress who rose to fame at the old Lyceum Theatre and has since become a star. I had seen her in a travelling company at the Fourteenth Street Theatre, and engaged her to support Mr. Sothern, first in The Maister of Woodbarrow and next in The Dancing Girl; and in both plays she gave a character and quality to the rôles that were found effective

and convincing. Effie Shannon, now also a star, appeared to great advantage in the ingénue rôles.

The Lyceum also sheltered one of the early achievements of Ethel Barrymore, who, in an English comedy, His Excellency the Governor, produced at a matinée by her manager, Charles Frohman, played the leading comedy rôle with such resplendent promise that she soon emerged from the ranks as a star. Stella, the leading rôle, was created in this country by that admirable actress, Jessie Millward, who had at the Empire Theatre also distinguished herself in Lord and Lady Algy. Miss Barrymore had, therefore, a severe test in following this artist. On the same stage her mother, Georgie Drew Barrymore, sister of John Drew, appeared in 1885; and Richard Mansfield and Mrs. Fiske in their first important starring days won applause in the little playhouse — although Mrs. Fiske had been a popular star since childhood. Ethel Barrymore's mother was a capital comedienne, and a woman of much wit and humour — a

quality not lacking in her distinguished daughter. In an engagement in San Francisco she was asked to take part in a special performance. She wired her manager in New York for permission. His reply was as follows: "No."

Her answer to this was equally brief.

It was: "Oh!"

This was more laconic than Artemus Ward's reply to the San Francisco manager, Thomas Maguire, who telegraphed Ward: "What will you take for forty nights in California?"

"Whiskey and water," was the response.

One of the most promising of the younger actresses was Margaret Anglin. She had acquired her dramatic training at one of the local schools, and I engaged her as a member of the company supporting Sothern. Her first part was that of the slavey in Lord Chumley, and, though the rôle had been previously played by several skilful actresses, she gave the part such effectiveness, naturalness and humour that I made her the understudy for Virginia Harned, the leading

woman. Miss Harned became ill, during a week of The Adventure of Lady Ursula, in the West, and Miss Anglin played the part so well that Mr. Sothern wired me:

"Keep your eye on Miss Anglin."

I answered: "Have had both eyes on her for months." Then she became the leading lady of the Empire Company in New York.

Miss Anglin's accumulation of successful interpretations as a star is still recent history.

Before her starring days Julia Marlowe called upon me. She was a slender, young and pretty girl, with a very expressive face, who besought my interest in her stage ambition. I immediately offered her the "juvenile business" in my company for the following season, but she refused it.

"Then what do you want?" I asked, feeling I had offered her a splendid opportunity.

"I want to go out as a star in Shakespeare!" she answered.

Knowing that it took time and many patient

years in those days to qualify as a star, especially in Shakespeare, I declined. But in the same season she gave a special matinée performance of Ingomar at the Bijou Theatre in New York and won the praise of the critics. The following year she succeeded in beginning her starring project in the "legitimate."

Henrietta Crosman, Julie Opp and Grace Elliston were also members of the Lyceum Company at periods — all of them now stars; but, like the heavenly bodies, one star differs from another in glory and brilliancy. Miss Crosman had been at Daly's and left his company to join mine. Mr. Daly about this time had sent me word not to encourage any members of his company to leave him. I replied that I never encroached upon another manager's company, but when applications were made to me I had no other recourse, if they were free, than to consider them. However, I said I would notify him when members of his company applied and would ask whether they were free. I had a

A DISTINGUISHED GROUP OF SEVERAL OF MR. FROHMAN'S OLD-TIME STARS

number of such experiences. When Miss Crosman applied I notified Mr. Daly; and as I received no reply I engaged her. One of her hits was as the widow in Haddon Chambers's play, The Idler, which the author first permitted to be performed at the Lyceum.

In the case of Julie Opp, her gravitation to the stage was quite natural. She had been writing on stage matters for the papers, and at my suggestion gave up literature for a stage career. I rehearsed her tentatively in several rôles. During the summer, in London, George Alexander made her an offer to join his company, which upon my advice she accepted. It gave her the advantage of stage training. When I was ready to produce Pinero's The Princess and the Butterfly at the Lyceum I engaged her to play the part of the Princess. In this play Miss Mannering made a great hit as Fay Zuliani, an Italian girl. Miss Opp was, as she is now, a fine-looking woman. I engaged Mrs. Osborn, who at that time was considering the practical side of stage work in

preference to literature, to dress her. So complete was Miss Opp's sartorial splendour, as the result of Mrs. Osborn's skill, that she gave unusual significance to the rôle. I was asked at the time whether I engaged Miss Opp because she looked like a princess.

"No," I replied; "because she looks as a princess ought to look." I then engaged Mrs. Osborn as a member of my forces, and her sole duty, for a period of two years, was to dress the women of my company. Miss Opp has since appeared with success in other rôles, and now stars with her husband, William Faversham. While Mrs. Osborn, now, unhappily, no more, established herself as a milliner of great taste and distinction for the smart set, developing also the department of costumes for the stage until it became one of the distinctive arts and features of the modern drama.

CHAPTER NINE

DION BOUCICAULT'S LAST EFFORTS AT THE DRAMA

ION BOUCICAULT, though he was the author of several hundred, more or less, original plays, had never been able, by frequent later attempts, to reach again the popular fancy. However, I thought the old veteran might possibly strike oil once more. I proposed that he write a play for my company, giving him six months' time in which to complete it. I wanted to produce it on the fiftieth anniversary of the first performance of his first play, London Assurance, and on the opening night he agreed to make an address.

During the progress of the play he wrote me: "I am keenly sensible that I must make a ten-strike, for many reasons. Since The Jilt I have done nothing. Therefore I am putting all my forces

into this play and have sidetracked every other work."

At another time he wrote: "I am desirous to strike exactly what you want and I don't mind objections. They only provoke my inventive faculty to a greater extent." Writing again later, referring to my company, then planned for serious work — "I find you stronger — much — on the pathetic than on the comic arm. You have plenty of shade. I am, as you know, strongest on sunlight effects."

As the play progressed I could not feel, as I told him on reading his elaborated scheme, convinced of its probable success. Later he wrote: "I want you to be more than satisfied — for my first effort on your stage must be one of my successes; that is essential to me, for many reasons. So, pray do not hesitate, if in doubt. It is better to discard at once, which I now feel inclined to do. I can easily shape another sketch. Therefore I invite you to have no reserve on the subject. If you think this one will not mill a thousand

dollars to the ton, say so. We are both experts. I can make another strike on the ledge, and we mean to get a bonanza!" Again he wrote: "I have sketched another subject, trying to meet your ideas, presuming that The Wife and The Charity Ball fulfilled them. I cannot write anything so gloomy and long-winded; but, with a band of crape around my foolscap and a white cravat to choke off my inherent love of bright colors, I have taken another flight."

His first effort was to have been a comedy drama. This, after it was elaborated, we were constrained to discard. The second attempt was to be an effort in pure comedy. From another letter I quote: "This subject submitted to you — the first play — was prepared to accord with the kind of drama you affected; but I confess it was not in my best vein. I much prefer the idyllic form and sunshine of Esmeralda to — if you will forgive me — the Bertha Clay fireside productions. I don't care for twilighted subjects. Let us sweep away the plot we entertained and break

fresh ground, in which comedy will flourish and a tear will always have a smile swimming in it."

Alas, to my regret, the second effort was no more successful than the first! Boucicault was then about seventy-five years old. The fire of invention in this fertile mind had become dim and was growing extinct. The author of The Shaughraun, The Colleen Bawn, The Jilt, London Assurance, The Octoroon, The Long Strike, Old Heads and Young Hearts, Arrah na Pogue, Rip Van Winkle and a hundred other successes, many of them skilful and expert adaptations, had come to the end of his great career. I have given these extracts from some of his letters merely to throw a little light upon the final efforts of the illustrious dramatist. He died about three years later, in 1890.

The career of my stock company was a successful one from year to year. We had our failures, but these are little remembered. The public remembers only the successes, it did not flock to our failures. Plays of merit do not always

thrive. Many works that failed to score the required financial success were nevertheless worth doing, if only to display the versatility of a well-rounded organization. But my plan was always to offer new, modern plays. Once, giving way to a general demand, I produced an old comedy. It was Boucicault's Old Heads and Young Hearts, written in the old comedy spirit, of which The School for Scandal and The Rivals are such distinguished prototypes. In this revival it was the first time the play had been given in the costume of its period, about 1840. Mr. Le Moyne's admirable and touching performance of Jesse Rural may still be remembered; and, as Lady Alice, Miss Cayvan had an opportunity to give expression to her engaging comedy talent. As an emotional actress she had marked limitations; but in reposeful, serious rôles she showed power and splendid poise. In comedy she was radiant with humour and exuberant in spirit. Mr. Kelcey and the late Nelson Wheatcroft played the brothers Coke. Mrs. Whiffen and

Charles Walcot, Miss Effie Shannon, Fritz Williams and Cyril Scott completed a splendid cast. I received a number of suggestions from the author, which were, of course, of value.

Mr. Boucicault came often to the theatre with his wife to see the various offerings, but he seldom saw more than the first act of a play. From this part of the performance the veteran playwright saw in his mind's eye the entire structure of the work; then, leaving his wife in her box, he spent the rest of the evening in my office. During these occasional visits the old gentleman was reminiscent and most interesting. Though he was the most prolific dramatist of his time, I was much impressed by his readiness, as he told me, always to receive suggestions while at work or rehearsing — no matter from whom. When he wrote London Assurance, a great deal of rewriting and revision was done at rehearsals. Many of the actors volunteered hints here and there, all of which, when appropriate and fitting, he incorporated in his text.

HERBERT KELCEY AND GEORGIA CAYVAN
in Old Heads and Young Hearts

"An author is foolish," he once said, "not to take advantage of every hint that could favour him. He must be quick and alert at rehearsals to see where he can adjust and readjust effects and scenes. Surprises come the first night that are sometimes disquieting, at other times delightful. I remember on one occasion," he continued, "I was to play a comic character in one of my plays. I had arranged to get a round of applause for a scene in which I extracted a charge from a gun which, it was known, the villain would furtively use to shoot the hero. When the scene arrived, and the gun failed, I listened for that round of applause. The audience was silent. I saw I had failed; but a few minutes after, when my own head appeared triumphantly at an upper window, a sudden tribute of applause followed. I saw that the result was right. I knew there was a 'round' due for that action, but I did not know, I had not divined, the exact place for it. But it was there, and I felt relieved. It is these things, these uncertainties, that

make the first performance of a new play exciting."

I dare say even the great Shakespeare had similar moments. One reason why the members of the theatrical profession disbelieve in the Baconian theory, and are convinced that Shakespeare was the author of his own plays, is that in all periods of the drama an author is present at rehearsals for such purposes as I have named. How true it would be of the great bard — who was not only a dramatist but also an actor, part owner of the theatre, and doubtless his own stage-manager — that, under the conditions that still obtain, from Shakespeare's day and Molière's, the contemporaneous evidence of authorship would be apparent through staging his own works! I can imagine the Divine William labouring heavily with his task, taking his manuscript home, and bringing back, for the next day's rehearsals, numerous revisions.

CHAPTER TEN

SHAKESPEARE AT THE FIRST REHEARSAL OF HAMLET

THE dramatic structure of Hamlet is peculiar — in fact, absolutely unique. If I may digress a moment, here we have a hero, vacillating, weak, procrastinating and irresolute, involved in a mesh of events from which he could not extricate himself. Urged on by the ghost of his father to his imposed task of vengeance, he yet hesitates to proceed, though he has the most unmistakable evidence of the king's guilt, as Horatio, Marcellus and Bernardo could bear witness. In the players' scene Hamlet does not dare to wreak vengeance upon him even though the evidence of the king's guilt is unmistakably revealed by his conduct, and he only kills Claudius finally at the end of the

make the first performance of a new play exciting."

I dare say even the great Shakespeare had similar moments. One reason why the members of the theatrical profession disbelieve in the Baconian theory, and are convinced that Shakespeare was the author of his own plays, is that in all periods of the drama an author is present at rehearsals for such purposes as I have named. How true it would be of the great bard — who was not only a dramatist but also an actor, part owner of the theatre, and doubtless his own stage-manager — that, under the conditions that still obtain, from Shakespeare's day and Molière's, the contemporaneous evidence of authorship would be apparent through staging his own works! I can imagine the Divine William labouring heavily with his task, taking his manuscript home, and bringing back, for the next day's rehearsals, numerous revisions.

CHAPTER TEN

SHAKESPEARE AT THE FIRST REHEARSAL OF HAMLET

THE dramatic structure of Hamlet is peculiar — in fact, absolutely unique. If I may digress a moment, here we have a hero, vacillating, weak, procrastinating and irresolute, involved in a mesh of events from which he could not extricate himself. Urged on by the ghost of his father to his imposed task of vengeance, he yet hesitates to proceed, though he has the most unmistakable evidence of the king's guilt, as Horatio, Marcellus and Bernardo could bear witness. In the players' scene Hamlet does not dare to wreak vengeance upon him even though the evidence of the king's guilt is unmistakably revealed by his conduct, and he only kills Claudius finally at the end of the

drama when he is goaded on, not by the impulse of vengeance for his dead father, but by reason of suddenly acquired knowledge, from Laertes, that the king had envenomed the rapiers and had poisoned his mother. Not until these accumulated deeds of perfidy on the part of the king were heaped upon him did he finally avenge his father's murder. It is not the action of Hamlet, but the psychology of the character that gives it so much tragic significance.

The play is, in its text, such a universal compendium of human knowledge, such a profound and overwhelming work as genuine dramatic literature, that such faults of construction, from the modern point of view, fall before such an achievement. Yet Shakespeare, valuing his supreme gift only as a mere means to a selfish end, was content to settle down in Stratford and cease writing! He had doubtless made several hundred thousand dollars, in our money, and so was rich enough to live the ordinary life of a country gentleman, and to emulate the ease and affluence of his old enemy

and neighbour, Sir Thomas Lucy, whom he is supposed to have caricatured in the part of Dogberry.

Now, if Shakespeare were confronted by modern conditions, the situation would be something like this: Being the Boucicault of his day, and selecting his wares wherever he found them, transmuting the baser material of his discovery into the refined gold coin of his intellectual realm, he has secured the position of dramatist for the Globe Theatre. Having written a number of popular comedies and several profoundly effective tragedies, he decides at this juncture to write a melodrama. Superstition being a potential problem of the time and theatregoing an intellectual delight, he has borrowed an old, cumbersome play, the story of which promised to be effective, namely, a murderer has killed a king — for the rabble wants to deal only with royal malefactors and the pomp and majesty of courts — and has usurped the dead man's throne. To heighten the dramatic effect, the murderer shall marry the deposed monarch's widow, so that the

tragic intimacy of the proposition shall be still more intense. Superimposed upon this splendid melodramatic structure, the avenging son shall trap the culprit by means of a play — thus adding a big situation to the thrilling possibilities of his scheme — the enacting of a play within a play. And, as I have said, the public being deeply interested in the concerns of the stage and players, a company of actors was introduced in a scene wherein certain subjects of the acting drama could be discussed from a popular point of view. In this scene of the play-actors, the author, through the mouth of the hero, could incidentally flagellate some of the players who had often, to his despair, misplayed their parts in previous plays.

For the climax, which is then thrillingly awaited by the spectators as well as by Hamlet and Horatio, the scene is ended at the psychological moment by Hamlet charging the amazed and panic-stricken king with the murder of his father. Then, after an exciting sword combat between the

principals, Horatio keeping back the frenzied crowd, the king is slain in good Elizabethan fashion. Here the curtain drops. Thus we have shudders, thrills, sword conflicts, a court spectacle, murders, bluster, riot, emotional fury and splendid opportunities for dramatic passion. Though this would complete a concrete and logical dramatic scheme, its brevity as a suitable drama was an objection. So Shakespeare resolved to delay the murder of Claudius by means of an irresoluteness of purpose on the part of Hamlet, thus following the structure of the original sources of the play and of the dramatist Kyd — from whose play Shakespeare modelled his own framework — withholding the final act of retribution until the end of the play.

This scheme having been accomplished and Burbage, the actor-manager, who played the leading parts in the Shakespearean plays, having been won over to it, rehearsals began. But here his principal difficulties developed. It was found that scenes had to be written in, exit speeches

devised, and excisions and emendations made. I can fancy Burbage stopping the rehearsal at a certain juncture to suggest that the rapidity of the action be stayed for a moment's thought; and the fertile author immediately noting the point for the next day's work. Or, the author might be tempted to say: "By the way, Dick, here are some reflections on life and death. How would this do in this scene?" "Bully!" says Dick, seeing a splendid oratorical opportunity for himself; "just the thing!" Or one can fancy, to parallel modern experience, Polonius coming to the prompter's table and saying: "I beg your pardon, Mr. Shakespeare, but I am the 'first old man' of this company. I'm blamed if I'll play this doddering old chamberlain. I never saw anything more idiotic than this scene" — showing the scene of humoured madness with Hamlet. "Oh, that's quite important," replies the author, "to reflect Hamlet's mental state; but I'll write you a scene shortly that will even matters up." And the next day Polonius is

made happy with the great speech of advice to Laertes that will go resounding down the ages.

Then comes the dividing of long soliloquies into two sections, as some authorities have stated, to balance scenes. So I am sure he went on — improving here, changing there — until the night of the dress rehearsal. I do not insist that this was the Bard's actual experience, but this is the modern method over and over. Though such events in the old Globe Theatre (which are common to the modern theatre), are purely imaginery, yet the author's constant work on his manuscript at the rehearsals would easily prove his authorship, no less than the evidence that exists of his partnership with his associates, Hemings and Condell, in the ownership of the Globe and the Black Friars theatres. But this is a considerable digression, I fear. It would prove, however, that the making of plays has not changed much since Queen Elizabeth's day.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE KENDALS' TRIUMPHS
MANAGEMENT OF MODJESKA

AS the years went on, suitable material for my company became increasingly difficult to obtain. On one occasion I besought an author to write a romantic play for me.

"I don't think," he said, "I could contrive any effective rôles for your middle-aged 'leads'!" "Middle-aged leads!" This made me think. On reflection it was true. I had grown up, too, with them, and so had failed to observe the lapse of time.

This episode reminds me of an incident told me by Mrs. Kendal. When Buckstone was the manager of the famous Haymarket Company, in London, he too had applied to a prominent author for a play. When the scenario was read to him he said: "Why, bless my soul, your characters are all old people!"

MR. AND MRS. KENDAL
at Niagara Falls, May 13, 1890

"Well," replied the author, "you said you wanted a play for your company!" Upon this, Mr. Buckstone, realizing the truth of the observation, engaged Mrs. Kendal — then Madge Robertson, who was the youngest sister of Tom Robertson, author of Caste, Our Boys, and other plays — as the leading juvenile woman of his company and W. H. Kendal as the leading man. And thus new life was projected into the organization. It was in this company that the Kendals — they were married while members of the company — began their great career.

Mrs. Kendal's youthful ambition had always been the hope that she might be able to earn ten pounds a week, in order that she could relieve her parents from the necessity of stage work. She was born in the village of Cleethorpe, England, and when she first appeared as a great actress in her native place, in The Lady of Lyons, she took the "calls" at the end of the play, by leading out with her the worthy Doctor who had brought her into the world.

For many years Mr. and Mrs. Kendal reigned in London as the chief and most interesting couple in the British metropolis. While they were in partnership with John Hare, the St. James Theatre, their dramatic home, became the resort of the modern drama.

The Kendals' engagements in this country, which were conducted under my management, were successful far beyond our most hopeful expectations. Though I was financially interested, Mr. Kendal took upon himself the entire financial risk. He felt that the American public, having heard of the Kendals for so many years, might possibly be disappointed when they actually revealed themselves: and if the venture did not prove successful, he felt he himself ought to pay the losses. So he provided himself with a letter of credit for fifty thousand dollars, and with some apprehension they made their first Atlantic voyage in 1889 and opened at the Fifth Avenue Theatre in A Scrap of Paper. Their four weeks' engagement drew audiences that tested the capac-

ity of the theatre, and this experience was duplicated everywhere. Only Sir Henry Irving, at increased prices, exceeded their receipts.

So popular did Mr. and Mrs. Kendal become that they made five tours in this country during as many seasons. Mrs. Kendal won her audience in a moment after her first entrance on the first night of her American engagement. Her exuberant spirits, her hearty and captivating comedy qualities, the subtlety of her humour, her splendid poise and handsome appearance justified, to her new audiences, the splendid reputation that had preceded her. Her first entrance in this opening play was with the significant line, "Well, here I am, good people!" The applause was tumultuous. The reception was so flattering that she realized she was among friends. American audiences, too, are remarkably hospitable in their first greeting to foreign artists, and when these make good they become lasting favourites.

Mr. Kendal himself came in for equal share of

appreciation; in fact, his admirable qualities as an actor were more heartily appreciated in this country than in England. As a comedienne Mrs. Kendal was a revelation; but not until she appeared in the serious part of Claire, in The Ironmaster, did the audience realize how equally supreme she was in emotional parts. As she had aroused laughter in Suzanne, in A Scrap of Paper, so did she obtain the instant tribute of tears in her scenes of feeling. It is difficult to describe her greatness in such scenes. Her expression, both of face and body, the manifestations of poignant and consuming suffering, the entire absence of straining or posing for effect, all so devoid of stage tricks, made her impersonation of serious parts irresistibly touching and compelling.

Off the stage Mrs. Kendal, probably the healthiest woman physically I have ever met, was a creature of superabundant good spirits. She had a sense and appreciation of humour that were unusually quick and responsive; and

MR. AND MRS. KENDAL
in The Second Mrs. Tanqueray, by Pinero

MRS. KENDAL AND HER DAUGHTERS,
MARGARET AND DOROTHY

as a *raconteuse* she had a wonderfully keen memory and a splendid comic gift. She was amazed and delighted with the bigness of this country. When I sent them to San Francisco I had to explain to her amazed perception that for six days she would be required to travel in a Pullman — to eat and sleep on the train. The journey to her seemed to cover an incredible distance. The longest railroad trip she had ever made was an eight-hour journey — the length of Great Britain.

Mr. Kendal was an expert draughtsman. If he had not become an actor he would undoubtedly have reached Royal Academy honours as a painter. He used to amuse himself, on tour, by making coloured drawings of scenes from his hotel window in the various cities. These he called his "views of the United States"; in fact, it was by reason of seeing him, as a young man, making sketches of a play in an English theatre, that the manager invited him to come as often as he chose to the theatre, for which he had a strong leaning.

Once when a play was being cast, it was found that the young artist was the only youngster about the establishment who was the possessor of several changes of costume, and so a rôle was asssigned to him. In this auspicious way he began as an actor. His family name was Grimston, but he adopted Kendal as his stage name. In private life the actor and his wife are known as Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Kendal-Grimston. Though Mrs. Kendal was the sister of Tom Robertson, the author of Caste, School, Ours, and a dozen other famous comedies, she never appeared in any of them. Those plays were written for Mr. and Mrs. Bancroft — now Sir and Lady Bancroft — when they occupied the little Prince of Wales Theatre in Tottenham Road, London, now long extinct.

Like most English people the Kendals had a horror of our steam-heated rooms, and they found our hot Pullman cars a terror that only necessity made them undergo. I have sat with them at breakfast in their hotel here frequently in winter while their opened windows admitted the cold

air until the room became chilled. I had to keep on my heavy overcoat, shivering, while they lounged with comfort through the meal.

A thing that shocked Mrs. Kendal was the amazing frequency with which she encountered the American cuspidor. On their first arrival I took them to see a new play at Daly's, in which were John Drew, Mrs. Gilbert and Ada Rehan. We occupied a box. The first thing she saw in it, was a commodious brass cuspidor! As she became familiar with American hotels and public places she grew used to the sight of these significant utensils. She has told that when she appeared at a rehearsal at a theatre in Nashville, Tennessee, she saw this notice posted in the footlights for the benefit of the actors: "Please do not spit into the footlights." When they got farther south, to Memphis, the same injunction took this abbreviated form: "Don't spit into the foots!"

At Minneapolis she was told the usual story, amusing when first heard, of how one day during a

church service the pastor said: "Our text will be from St. Paul." At this half the congregation, envious of the rival city, left the building. There was another incident she was fond of relating. In Chicago a reporter, evidently an Englishman, came to interview her. He was in the last stages of sartorial disintegration. She inquired about certain very wealthy people of the city. "Oh," he said, "they're not worth while. They're in trade!"

In London the Kendals have a large commodious house in Portland Place. The house is adorned with many valuable art objects and countless souvenirs — gifts from royalty and from lesser lights; and some of the fine paintings that adorn their walls are prizes purchased from the various annual Academy Exhibitions.

Mr. Kendal is a great smoker. He has a cabinet built in his study, large enough to contain about ten thousand cigars. These are reënforced from time to time by special purchases of choice brands. An Englishman likes his cigar dry.

In the humid atmosphere of Great Britain, dryness does not spoil the weed; and so this epicure of nicotine can please his palate and those of his friends by a most varied choice. He once gave me one of a choice brand of cigars that had been purchased by him and John Hare some eight years previously. At another time he presented me with one of a special brand that he had had in his possession four years. On my commenting upon its fine flavour he observed that it was from a box I had presented to him, and this box had been added to his extensive stock.

Mrs. Kendal had often been tendered munificent opportunities in her younger days to play in various productions in England. These she always refused, because she would not separate from her husband. This was on account of a promise made to her father. The elder Robertson was himself an actor, but he did not wish his daughter to marry into that precarious profession. He objected, therefore, to Kendal, because it naturally superimposed the necessity of sep-

arating husband and wife through professional engagements. When he found that only unhappiness would ensue if he forced his daughter to obey he made her swear that she would never play apart from her husband. By obedience to this command they became not only the most popular couple in England but their "team work" has earned them a fortune.

There was only one cloud in Mrs. Kendal's career in America. When she enacted the part of Paula in The Second Mrs. Tanqueray, the critics not only deprecated her accepting a part of this kind but criticised her taste in appearing in a rôle so at variance with her career as a woman and an actress. She had been called the "British matron" of the drama because of the purity of her domestic life. In speaking of this she said: "As an actress I may play all dramatic rôles. It was not I who gave myself this title." She could not forgive the press for its hostile attitude.

Since these lines are reminiscent, I cannot refrain from a little digression to speak of my

MADAME MODJESKA
In 1886

associations with the late Madame Modjeska, whom I managed in 1885, just before I began my career at the Lyceum Theatre. Having then no theatrical local habitation, I spent the year on tour with the Polish actress. Like Edwin Booth, her latter-day appearances did not do justice to her resplendent talent, though they could not altogether conceal the charm of a personality that was most rare. Her audiences in those days were drawn to her as personal friends, and her real friends in every part of the country were many. She had a gentle, captivating and thoroughly feminine nature. Her characters were embodiments of sweet and lofty womanhood. And in no part did she display her gentle charm and power so much as in Adrienne Lecouvreur. She refers in her own recent memoirs to the fact that, though Adrienne was not the best drawing card in her repertoire, I nevertheless kept this play, against her remonstrances, in our list of offerings; but she does not reveal under what conditions I managed to

hold her to this task. I personally enjoyed her work in Adrienne, and never failed to watch her performance from the quiet recesses of a private box. Knowing that, in consequence of its light labour and simple costuming, she always sought to play Rosalind in the one-night towns, I finally proposed, though it was not always prudent policy, to let her play that rôle during these short engagements, in exchange for her agreement to play Adrienne once every week. So she gave me Adrienne in exchange for Rosalind.

Madame Modjeska was always in a happy mood when she enacted comedy. She was usually sad and depressed when Mary Stuart, Camille or any other exacting serious rôle occupied her mind — sad even to tears. I have often seen her, in her dressing room, weeping as though she had suffered a bereavement; but she had her reactionary moments too, and Rosalind made her quite gay and sportive. She was then a merry and jolly companion. Her husband, the Count Bozenta, now living in Poland, was a highly

educated man. She told me once that, when she was acting in her native country, the Count, who was then a journalist, became deeply enamoured of her and besought, through friends, an introduction. He was taken to her house to await her appearance after the performance.

Meantime he and his friends were entertaining themselves as well as they could, and the Count was not backward in such an art. He was standing on a sofa, telling a story, with many exuberant gesticulations. The sofa stood obliquely across the corner of the room. In the midst of this diversion his "unexpressive she" suddenly entered. So surprised was he at the sudden irruption of his divinity that, in consternation, he fell backward from the sofa into the corner behind. When he shyly emerged, amid much laughter, he was formally introduced. The couple became deeply attached to each other and to the time of her death were inseparable.

My own contract with her in 1885 provided that I pay her a weekly salary of seventeen hundred

and fifty dollars and furnish her at my expense with a private car and carriages. Modjeska never missed a performance. Once — it was in Baltimore — she was so ill that I was summoned to her room by the Count to decide upon any necessary action. It was the first day of the engagement. I at once told the Count and Madame that we would close the theatre for a couple of days. The doctor approved of this. I was about to leave the room to arrange for the postponement, when from beneath the blankets she asked me not to decide yet. But I was determined. She said: "Wait until four o'clock." I yielded and said I would return at that hour. At four, though she did not appear to be any better, she insisted that she would play. She would not listen to our expostulations. I knew that she felt that the loss would be mine, but I was equally anxious for her health. However, she persisted.

The play was As You Like It. She came to the theatre; her attendants prepared her for the

performance, though she seemed little fit for the ordeal, and I feared a breakdown. When she heard the overture she braced up, and at her cue made her entrance amid a cordial round of applause. She played the first act merrily and the denunciation scene with her usual force. When the curtain dropped we caught her as she fainted. Fortunately there was no change of dress required. She had "underdressed" for the second act, and all that was required was to remove the Rosalind gown to reveal the boy's costume. She persisted in again going on, and she played her succeeding acts with equal gayety and buoyancy, but, at the close of each act, had to be carried to her dressing-room exhausted. In this way the play reached its conclusion safely. The next morning the papers, ignorant of the true state of things, said that the actress played Rosalind with all her accustomed exuberance and charm. She grew better the next day, and by her supreme fortitude she saved the week. We found As You Like It, Twelfth Night,

Two Gentlemen of Verona and Mary Stuart, our best cards in the West. The growing people of the Middle West, then, as now, gave greater patronage to the standard plays than did the public of the large Eastern cities.

Once, when we were playing Twelfth Night in St. Paul, as I was coming out with the crowd at the conclusion of the play, I heard a man remark, in language not suggesting extreme culture: "That was a rotten play!" Another said: "That rotten! Why, man, that's Shakespeare!" "Is it?" was the reply. "Well, then, the company's rotten." Even this person would accept Shakespeare on trust.

For a new French play, Prince Zillah, I had secured for Madame Modjeska I needed two large boar-hounds. I finally got them. In one scene, with the villain of the play, the heroine is roused to fury by his insults. As he leaves the scene she calls for her faithful hounds. She holds them apparently struggling in leash at the side of the stage, though they were really restrained

by an unseen rope held by a strong stagehand in the wings. She has a speech, and at its conclusion she shouts to the dogs to fly after the villain. They have been violently demonstrative during this scene, evidently in sympathy with their mistress, eager to rush across the stage to avenge the insults. Off they go with bounds and leaps, and the villain, judging from the sounds, is torn to pieces in the opposite wings. In reality the dogs had been starved during the day, and during this scene the property man, on the side of the villain's exit, held in tempting view of the animals large juicy bits of red meat. By this means they gave their nightly performance with enthusiastic realism.

I lived in Stamford at this time and, before the season began, I kept the dogs at my home, frequently taking long walks with them. They looked so ferocious that wayfarers scampered out of the way and sometimes over convenient fences. Desiring to give my fellow-townsmen a treat, I determined to open Madame Modjeska's

season in the local town hall. The dogs were not in the play given that evening. The actress and her husband were staying at my house. My entire household, including the servants, attended the performance. I left Bruno, the largest and most ferocious of the dogs, in the house to guard the premises, as it was on a hill a couple of miles from the theatre. On our return it began to rain heavily. We had three carriages, and I was in the last one. As we arrived inside the grounds I shouted to those ahead not to get out, as the dog was guarding the house. I ran ahead in the rain. I entered by a French window of the dining-room, calling out the name of the dog that he might hear his master's voice. I buttoned my coat close around my throat in case of a sudden attack, all the time calling the dog and apprehensively feeling my way in the dark from room to room. There was no answer; nothing but the howling storm outside. I made my way upstairs to my own room. I heard a sound as of a tail heavily striking the floor.

I lit the gas. There, under my bed, was the ferocious monster, so frightened that I had to drag him out. Then he jumped up and became friendly. I rushed down and shouted, "All's safe!" and the others trooped in. A few weeks later, on our way to Easton, the dog, being carried in the baggage car where he was tethered by the neck, jumped through the side door, and the poor beast unintentionally hanged himself. He was not discovered until the train arrived at our stopping place.

Losses through Western property and the great demands on Modjeska by her Polish relatives abroad deprived her of much of her earnings, and failing health prevented her from continuing steadily in stagework. This situation prompted the suggestion of a benefit in her behalf a few years ago. Mr. Paderewski, a lifelong friend of Modjeska and her husband, came to me to propose the scheme, knowing, as he did, my affection for the actress. I gladly undertook the work. Unfortunately, a few days before the

performance, Mr. Paderewski met with an accident in his private car, which not only forced him to cancel his own engagements but deprived me of his services at the performance. Nevertheless we realized ten thousand dollars from the affair.

In the Modjeska Testimonial performance the following members of the profession contributed their services:

Ada Rehan, Miss Russell, Mrs. Pat Campbell, Mary Shaw, Kate Denin Wilson, John Malone, Edmund Clarence Stedman, the poet, John Glendenning, Horace Lewis, Margaret Illington, Helena Modjeska, Vladimir De Pachmann, Barton Hill, David Bispham, John E. Kellard, Vincent Serrano, Guy Standing, James O'Neill, William Courtenay, Morgan Coman, Gustav Saenger, Edith Taliaferro, and the late Louis James.

Owing to Mr. Paderewski's breakdown, a long letter from him was read by Mr. Edmund Clarence Stedman. The great pianist occupied a box. He also contributed generously to the receipts.

That Shakespeare is generally more popular with the masses on the East Side of New York and in the West than on Broadway is proved by general experience. A few months ago Mr. Sothern was quoted in one of the New York papers as having said, referring to this matter, that "Broadway was rotten." He told me he never used such an unparliamentary expression. "I did say that we did better business at the Academy of Music, on the East Side, than we did on Broadway."

Everybody knows that poor people are more interested in Shakespeare's plays than the rich. I met a man at dinner last year who was asked at the table if he ever went to any Shakespearean performances. He said: "Oh, no; I saw them when I was a child." I sat next to a woman at a performance of Romeo and Juliet, and she said to her neighbour: "This talk sets me crazy. I wish they'd say 'crackers and cheese,' or something one can understand." A friend of mine asked a rich man if he would like to see Sothern

and Marlowe in a Shakespearean play, and the rich man said: "No! I'd as soon read the Bible!" So one is forced to consider, as Mr. Sothern did, the effect on various minds; and to conclude that, when business for Shakesperean plays is at least one-third greater at one dollar and fifty cents on the East Side than at two-fifty on Broadway, the poorer people are its chief patrons.

Miss Olga Nethersole came under my management in 1895 for two years, during which we produced a dramatic version of Carmen, which was very successful, although Miss Nethersole's best work as an artist, seemed to be disclosed in the rôle and play of Denise, an English version of a French play by the late Clement Scott. We afterward produced Carmen at the Adelphi Theatre, London, with Charles Dalton and Lena Ashwell in the cast; but neither the play nor Miss Nethersole's work in it appealed to the English public. While presenting Carmen in this country, Mlle. Calvé, the great operatic artist, was delighting the musical

public with her splendid enactment of this rôle in Bizet's opera. It was generally understood that the singer resented the actress's encroachment upon a rôle, even in its dramatic form, that she felt belonged to her. On my voyage to London the following season, Miss Nethersole and our company, and many of the stars of the opera, were on board. Among the latter were Mlle. Calvé, the two De Reszkes, and a dozen other singers. As a concert was to be organized, I suggested to Miss Nethersole that she attempt to bring about the *entente cordiale* between herself and the eminent singer. This she did with infinite grace and tact, as it was thought well to have both the artists appear at the ship's concert, which the Captain desired me to organize. But Mlle. Calvé, while willing to contribute money (as the De Reszkes did) to the seamen's fund, refused to sing. The question was, how to get her to participate in the concert. Miss Nethersole received daily some fresh flowers stored for her from her friends ashore. These,

after her own recitation, she proposed to sell, and obtained Mlle. Calvé's consent to assist her in disposing of them at this juncture. Bronson Howard was the chairman of the concert. We had a preconcerted plan of action. When the great singer (in French) offered her floral wares, the chairman responded by saying, "I will give Mlle. Calvé twenty-five dollars for one bouquet, if she will accompany it with a little song." Upon this the audience grew wildly demonstrative. Mlle. Calvé, overcome by the display of enthusiasm, seemed to be carried away by the excitement, and so sang three songs, amid further complimentary demonstrations. Through the rest of the voyage, these ladies' friendship became firmly fixed. The receipts for that concert were nearly $700.00 — a very large sum in those days, before the big ships had appeared.

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE DISCOVERY OF KUBELIK NEW CONDITIONS

THOUGH Kubelik, the Bohemian violinist, is not a dramatic star, he came into my orbit while I was in London one summer in the interest of my company. Going casually to a Kubelik concert at St. James Hall, I heard the young man play. I was delighted with his wonderful skill and charm and I could not help noting the effect he had on his audience. I went to a second concert and realized that he was a unique and remarkable artist. There was, above all, something in this young artist's manner that impressed me profoundly. I felt he ought to come to America, and, though I had no experience in musical matters as a business, I could not avoid the conviction that he would prove a great success, not alone with music lovers but

with the general public. I called upon him and his manager, and asked the latter why Kubelik did not go to America. He said they would like to go, that they had been corresponding with several musical agents and managers, but they would not pay his terms. They wanted a guaranty of one thousand dollars a concert. Estimating his value in America by the imprudent equation of my own enthusiasm, I soon came to terms.

Kubelik's first appearance in New York, at Carnegie Hall in December, 1901, brought about my head a storm of indignant comment from numerous musical critics. I had advertised my musical attraction far more generously than was the custom; in other words, he was, as they ironically characterized it, "circused." This was found to be an objection so severe that the resentment intended for me was visited upon my star; but the receipts were the largest any foreign artist ever had on his American début in many years — all the money the house could hold and

hundreds turned away. His success with the audience was immediate, but the critics were still reserved. His second performance, during the same week, was equally large and the audience, it being a matinée, was even more wildly enthusiastic than on his first appearance. I felt that my conviction was correct. Kubelik's success had been equalled by but one other great instrumentalist, the wonderful Paderewski. I explained to some of my musical friends that I desired to present my artist enthusiastically to the big-paying public, not tentatively and quietly to the non-paying musical profession. I had no time to let him grow. My contract was too rigorous. I wanted him to begin at the maximum at once.

So overwhelming was the successs of the Bohemian artist that a leading magazine editor commissioned Mr. H. E. Krehbiel, the musical critic of the *Tribune* to write an article for his magazine on Kubelik's art. Mr. Krehbiel accepted, "but only," he said, "after I shall have been convinced of his skill as a great artist after

hearing him several times more." Mr. Krehbiel, who is the dean of American musical criticism, finally yielded to the artist's power, and wrote a splendid eulogy of his art. Two days before Kubelik's first appearance in New York I was called to the telephone by a message from the late William C. Whitney, the millionaire. "I want Kubelik to play at my house about eleven o'clock Tuesday night," he 'phoned.

"That is the evening of his American début," I said.

"I know that. What are your terms?"

"Fifteen hundred dollars," I replied. I heard him give a long whistle at the 'phone.

"That's pretty steep," he said.

"I pay him nearly that myself," I replied, and said I was not anxious he should play again that evening, as he had to leave for Boston very early the following morning, to rest there and rehearse.

However, Mr. Whitney paid the money. Mr. Kubelik's own personal share of his first

night's work was nearly three thousand dollars. He has been to America three times. On his last opening appearance in New York I engaged the Hippodrome. Here he drew over five thousand dollars — the capacity — at the prices I had made for that occasion. No other instrumental artist has ever been able to achieve such results. Kubelik is now a grown-up man. He is happily married, has a pair of violin-playing twins about six years old, and owns a beautiful castle in Bohemia.

In 1889, as I have stated before, I moved my stock company to Daly's Theatre, as the old house on Fourth Avenue was doomed by the march of progress. It closed its career in March, 1902, with Annie Russell and the late Mrs. Gilbert, in a play called The Girl and The Judge, by Clyde Fitch.

Upon Mr. Daly's death I acquired the lease of his theatre, and the company continued here for several years. During this period Cecilia Loftus, Jameson Lee Finney, Robert Hilliard

and Margaret Illington were added to my company. Miss Loftus had left the ranks of vaudeville to become a member of my company. After a season in the company, I gave her the leading business with E. H. Sothern, in whose company Margaret Illington continued her career. After Miss Loftus's engagement with Sothern I starred her in Zangwill's Serio-comic Governess.

My New Lyceum Theatre, on West Forty-fifth Street, was opened in November, 1903, when E. H. Sothern inaugurated my first season with The Proud Prince.

The corner-stone was laid by members of my old Lyceum staff, some of whom are still with me. E. G. Unitt, my scene painter, had been with me a quarter of a century; so had the property man, Wm. Campf.

But new theatrical conditions began to prevail. The era of the regular stock company, the manager's personal family, as it were, seemed to have passed away. Theatres and places for public amusement began to multiply enormously and

the star system reached its height. A certain class of stock company is now a feature of all cities, but these companies are not assembled for the purpose of producing new works. They reproduce the successes of past seasons. With manuscripts suitably marked and ready for acting, they are enabled with very few rehearsals to act out the story of the plays that have made fame in previous seasons.

It is not a bad scheme. It creates and cultivates theatregoers among the masses. But there is not time to develop the subtlety and finer qualities of the actor's part. The prices are usually low and within the reach of all. These theatres become missionaries and gradually develop a taste on the part of their audiences for the higher-grade companies and stars.

There is another reason that explains the absence of a general stock producing company, in the fact that it is safer for the manager of a first-class theatre to present a special company for each play and send the original company on

tour, rather than that each play produced should be relegated to the travelling repertoire of a single company. It is preferred, too, by the authors, who thus draw royalties from a play continually maintained by a special company.

At one time all the principal cities maintained their regular stock companies. They produced chiefly the standard drama, and often new plays. The companies were excellent, because the travelling company had not then become a feature of American theatricals. The principal stars, like Forrest, Booth, Charlotte Cushman, John McCullough, Lawrence Barrett, Maggie Mitchell, Lotta and many others, used to travel without their own companies. They were always supported by the local organization, which was rehearsed a week in advance by the star's stage manager. The scenery was furnished by the local manager.

Later on, actors like the elder Sothern and Boucicault would tour with two or three special members important to the finer points of the

play and necessary for the special scenes in which these star actors were concerned.

Gradually stars, not desiring to rehearse every week, undertook to furnish their own entire company. On such occasions the local company would make a week's tour to adjacent towns. Gradually the entire system was changed. The local companies were abandoned and the local houses given up to bookings for an entire season of the various stars and travelling attractions. That is now the system in the principal first-class theatres.

So the stock company, as it was known, is apparently a thing of the past; and yet I have still a lurking hope that a permanent company of actors for the production of new plays may yet prove possible.

I have enjoyed living over again these shifting scenes of the past. It has given me the keenest delight to recall the faces and to dwell briefly on the achievements of some of the players with whom I have been associated. Most of them are

still in their prime, advancing their way in the sunshine of success. I feel honoured to have walked in the shadow by their side. Unlike the other arts, the fame of the actor is but a breath, a memory. The written word, which records his work, cannot reproduce the charm, the imagination or the eloquence that inspired his achievements. They have been not only "the abstract and brief chronicles of their time," but are and always will be potent factors in the art, the graces and forces of civilization.

PART TWO

CHAPTER I

THE COMPOSITION OF PLAYS

THE careers of most plays are alike up to a certain point; then, fortunately, they differ. The author conceives a plot and enthuses over it. He takes it to a manager. Once the latter invests money he, too, enthuses. The cast is engaged, parts assigned, and weeks of toil and much money are spent. Then, with hope and apprehension balancing in the scales, they await the opening night. It comes. The curtain rises hopefully and drops either amid plaudits of approval or silent disappointment. The critics may praise or condemn as they see fit. But the verdict from which there is no appeal is given by the public. Yet why do plays fail?

A curious legend sometimes follows a big success. The play has been rejected by Managers

A, B, C and D. People say that the managers are all wrong. On the contrary, Manager A very likely saw a great fault in the work — one he deemed insurmountable. He frankly pointed it out to the playwright, who, being a sensible fellow, corrected it and passed the work on to Manager B. Manager B developed a crop of complaints and made suggestions which the author availed himself of and handed the manuscript to Manager C. Thus the weak points of the play were fortified, the strong ones emphasized, and when it reached the stage it was an available bit of work — possibly a great success. But one rarely hears of the collaboration of the men to whose helpful suggestions the success of the play is largely due. Instead, these managers are charged with stupidity, lack of discernment, and as being unable to recognize masterpieces. Nevertheless, mistakes in judgment are usual in the theatrical as well as in the publishing business. A man who can pick out "winners" would be worth a fabulous salary.

MISS OLGA NETHERSOLE

Plays are built up. It is the business of everybody, from stage manager to scene shifter, just as it is that of the author, to help along the illusion. Dion Boucicault, who made more money out of his plays than any living author, said that, when he produced a play, he was always alive to suggestions from managers, actors or property men — that he had pursued this policy from the time he wrote London Assurance, and that it paid. The trouble is that many authors, eager for production and profit, project their works with such haste that the revisions suggested by managers are only those which might naturally have occurred to themselves had they allowed more time for the incubating process. Shakespeare was a practical dramatist and manager. He wrote for his kind and for his company and for his box-office. Very likely he sat at the prompt table at rehearsals and rearranged, transposed and readjusted scenes and situations to comply with the demands that the rehearsals revealed to him. It may be that some

of his greatest lines occurred to him during this building-up process. I don't say they did, but it was possible, for nothing brings an author into such close contact with the issues of his work as the practical development of it at rehearsals in its raw stage in the theatre.

Nor does the amount of work put into a play foreshadow its success. The most popular plays are often accidents. Few masterpieces were designed as such. The unexpected, the surprising, effective and far-reaching frequently come out in a play during its rehearsal and give it value. It is often said of plays that fail that "they read well."

Conversation is the bane of the drama. But dialogue, growing out of the action of the story, is quite another thing. Many plays have little apparent dramatic significance when read, yet the coördination of their parts and the peculiar structure of their ethical purposes produce results sometimes no less surprising to their authors than to their managers. Accidents at rehearsals,

either with lines, scenery or properties, frequently change, develop or suggest "effects." Such details often prove of great value.

The subtle quality of a play is the essence embodied in the feeling it produces, rather than in lines and arbitrary physical action. That this quality is elusive is shown by the varying fate of the works of successful authors. If one could capture it and imprison this essence in a bottle like a magic lamp, and invoke it at pleasure, the mystery of play-writing would be solved. The old saying of managers that the road to success would be easy if every bad play failed and every good play succeeded, would be obsolete, since there would be no more bad plays. But we have no bottle-imp to guide or restrain us.

Many well-constructed and well-written plays fail because they are not based on a pleasant subject — one that did not find favour with audiences. This is true of many plays that treat of phases of life which, while they exist, are not

good material for general audiences. It must be remembered that the success of a play is due largely to its attractiveness, as a subject for discussion around the family hearthstone, since in this way it gets its most valuable endorsements. To be sure, this is a business point of view rather than an artistic one, but it is essential. Unfortunately the "problem" play or the freak drama always suggest subjects that are not only often immoral, but portray phases of life, which, though common, are grim and unattractive, if not actually repulsive. We know that life is not happy for everybody concerned, that poverty, distress, immorality exist, but the dramatic elements of these conditions are neither attractive nor essential in plays. The stage's best mission should more generally reflect life, not as it is, but as it should be.

But there are also wholesome problem plays. The fairy pantomimes are problem plays — symbolical of vice and virtue. All plays are, of course, constructed on certain symbolical theses, re-

flected in the theatrical movements and motives of the stage characters. The evils of greed, the virtue and vice of love, the promptings of remorse, the quality of renunciation, the masquerades of hypocrisy — are all factors in the making of attractive problem plays. They need not be necessarily clinical studies because they postulate "problems." Cinderella and Her Glass Slipper is a problem fairy story; the slipper is only symbolical of a kind of woman that the Prince seeks. The slipper may be modesty, red hair or a sweet disposition — the embodiment of an idea.

It is impossible to tell with certainty from the reading of a play whether or not it will succeed, since certain qualities hidden even during rehearsal may develop, quite accidentally, at the first public performance. A propos: a certain play was dragging heavily. The manager, who flattered himself that he had provided for every possibility of a halt, was greatly puzzled. One of the characters had been banished to a foreign country. The actor playing this part mistook his cue and

made his entrance at a moment not designed by the playwright, but which proved so opportune that it literally brought down the house. The manager noted the effect and the play was revised so as logically to admit of the very striking entrance, which was deemed by the critics the hit of the occasion.

Many plays develop opportunities during rehearsals. When Mr. Sothern and I produced Captain Lettarblair, the heroine had to leave the hero's apartment in anger. At her exit, as she turned toward the hero, her dress was accidentally caught in the door; so she couldn't leave the apartment. The captain, not seeing the cause, could not understand her hesitancy. The rehearsal was stopped. But we regarded it as good "business," and an elaborate scene was developed by Mr. Sothern which evoked roars of laughter. In Lord Chumley the slavey accidentally left her huge feather-duster sticking, feathers upward, in a chair. Lord Chumley had to sit on this piece of furniture. The feathers tickled his

AN ACCIDENT AT A REHEARSAL OF CAPTAIN LETTARBLAIR

at the Lyceum, incorporated and developed as a feature. Virginia Harned's dress caught in the door

head. He started with a shout of alarm. He began to remonstrate with the actress for her carelessness, when it was suggested that this be made a part of the "business" of the scene. It always provoked a roar of laughter. Incidents of this kind can be multiplied. To get a laugh in the right place is always sought. But the comedians are frequently eliminated from a scene while a bit of serious acting is impending, because their presence inevitably reminds the audience, in the wrong place, of their previous laughter-provoking efforts, and so the right balance is observed.

The play upon which the comic opera Erminie was founded (Robert Macaire) was a peculiarly serious drama. The Parisian public, however, did not take it so. At its first presentation the serious actions and speeches caused most unwonted merriment. The manager was dumfounded. He watched the curious effect for a time and then, being a man of infinitely sound sense, went behind the scenes, called his cast together, and said,

"Just play this piece as comedy." They did so with great success, and it ran a year.

Plays defective in construction, in the quality of the literature, and in the characterization of the parts may still prove money-making works owing to their element of profound human appeal. Others, evolved with care in the development of plot and character, which might be ranked as classics, fail in spite of their perfect artistic proportions because they do not grip the heart-strings. The accepted standards for plays adopted by managers are works which embody a great love story. Yet no rule can be regarded as certain. Plays have succeeded which defied the conventions of the drama because they have been great in other qualities. A love story is usually the required theme — some form, for it admits of many; yet Hamlet is not a love story. In point of structure it seems to defy the laws of the drama, yet it contains a law of its own — that manifested in the theme of retribution. From modern standards the play would seem to

MAUDE ADAMS (in centre) WITH E. H. SOTHERN IN LORD CHUMLEY, AT THE LYCEUM, 1899. BELLE ARCHER AT LEFT

AN ACCIDENT AT A REHEARSAL WITH E. H. SOTHERN, INCORPORATED IN LORD CHUMLEY

come to an end when Hamlet discovers the guilt of the king. His delay in working out his revenge, his constant vacillation, have caused much discussion. But the play has in it so much of the philosophy of life that it is, from the dramatic and literary point of view, a compendium of human speculative experience.

The School for Scandal also defies certain modern canons. It has no love story. It reveals the humorous bickerings of an ill-assorted couple — an old man married to a girl in her teens — while the relations of Charles with his sweetheart are only dimly suggested. The play not only reflects the frailty of character as revealed to him in the days of Sheridan, but discloses vagaries of human nature that fit all times.

Rip Van Winkle made Joe Jefferson's fortune, yet the audience is expected to sympathize with a character who is a drunkard, a vagrant, the village ne'er-do-well, and a blot on the morals of the little community. All the virtuous action developed in the play is designed to incur the

resentment of the audience, while the unregenerate Rip's frailties and peccadillos capture the sympathetic tear. Hundreds of thousands of persons have wept out of smypathy for the lazy old Dutch sportsman. But this fact was due more to the inexpressible charm and magnetism of the chief actor than to the quality of the play.

The play of The Thief is also a good instance of an author's daring. In it the heroine, with whom the audience is expected to sympathize, commits a crime, the punishment for which, under ordinary conditions, would be imprisonment. Moreover, the author violates one of the canons of art by not taking his audience into his confidence as to the identity of the culprit, in the first act. Yet so effective is the embodied story of love between husband and wife that remorse is substituted for conventional punishment and forgiveness and happiness result. But all this is wrought by the deft and expert treatment of the author. The secret of many successful plays will be found to lie in their treatment.

Thus some of the greatest successes of the stage have defied certain accepted laws of the drama when considered as closely, scientifically, as this elusive subject permits. The genius of authors in creating types of characters, in themselves epitomes of human nature, often carries plays into popular favour, despite weakness of plot. Drama that involves the struggle of the soul in its contest with fate is always a powerful theme. Such a subject was treated with great philosophic insight by the old dramatists. But it must be approached differently to-day. The modern stage requires movement — not necessarily physical. A subject may be so projected that it involves a clash and conflict that can be developed in lines of dialogue that move quickly to what is called a "situation." The earlier dramatists used to philosophize through their characters in elaborate speeches, But the feeling to-day is opposed to long literary harangue, or any soliloquies at all. Conditions of life are different from those of the period of the literary

drama. The stage was then the arena for the literary giants. Now we can get our literature in books, magazines, Sunday newspapers. Life is more strenuous. We accomplish more because of economic forms of civilization which bring the peoples of the earth close together. Therefore, life and character mirrored on the stage must reflect similar conditions — concise, striking, appealing — to be effective. But the greatest factor, as I said before, lies in suitable and clever "treatment."

CHAPTER TWO

WHY PLAYS FAIL

HUMAN nature in its elemental phases is the same as it has always been. Dramatic appeal, therefore, should be made through the primary passions. A story involving love, jealousy, hate, cupidity, revenge, self-sacrifice are common subjects of the drama, because true drama deals with these elements. But the writer must have such a grasp of human nature as to make his ethical subject convincing. By this I mean the impulse or conduct which forces the clash of character, the struggle — for every drama is essentially a struggle. The motives must be clear and convincing and they must be established early in the drama or the attention of the audience will wander to an inspection of the proscenium, or the occupants of the

boxes. Even the villain must do wrong from the logical impulse to do wrong, but never from a good motive — or he'd be a hero. A play requires light and shade. The elements of good and evil are, of course, epitomized in the hero and villain. Dramatists of the restoration period, and later, frankly designated their characters by their leading attributes. Thus down to Richard Brinsley Sheridan's day such characters as Peter Teazle, Oliver Surface, Harry Bumper, Benjamin Backbite, Charles Surface, Careless, Snake, Crabtree, Lady Sneerwell and Mrs. Candor, reflecting in their names their characters, were still in vogue. To-day, however, characters reveal themselves by action and very quickly. Therefore the sooner their motives are revealed the sooner the audience becomes interested. Delay the motive and purpose of a play—and you court danger.

A quick reading of a manuscript shows to the practised eye that the majority of plays submitted by amateurs are lacking in well-defined plot,

in form and sound dramatic purpose. Many are composed of rambling, diffusive conversations — events and conditions revealed through talk — rather than by means of well-developed action. But our business is with the plays that find favour with the managers. Very likely the reason that many of these fail rests with the public, since the managers have found in them the elements of success and have reduced, so far as their skill and judgment would permit, the chances of their failure to a minimum.

One of the chief causes of failure of plays is lack of concentrated interest. Many plays have too many acting scenes, move so rapidy, and are so diffusive in movement under the wrong impression by the author that action is everything and character development of less value, that the stories involved do not fasten themselves upon the imagination. The author should, above all things, be economical of the mind of his audience, should not divert, but, on the contrary, hold it firmly to the main line of his story. The story

need not be one single thread of a theme. It may be paralleled by another subject. In fact, for the sake of relief or variety, there should be parallel subjects, but everything should contribute effect and interest to the gradual unfolding of the main climax or catastrophe. Plays also fail because, though well constructed and containing effective characters, the general interest is not sufficiently engrossing. That depends upon the significance or value of the theme. The work must have not only something to say, but something worth saying, saying with deep and convincing force and conviction whether it be farce or drama.

The play If I Were King, produced by Mr. Sothern when he was under my management, has been one of his greatest successes, and it will doubtless continue to grace his repertoire as long as he chooses; but, after the first rough rehearsal of the play, I saw many grave defects in its structure which I am sure would have jeopardized its chances of success. It is a fanciful story about

Villon, the French poet, and Louis XI, in which the scapegrace saves France; but the play was based upon too many political complications, and the sentimental, or "heart" interest, in which romance should abound, was slight. We stopped work on the play, postponed the date of the production, and the author readily agreed to develop the interest of the story upon sentimental rather than political lines. He worked at it night and day, and the hero's motive changed from military ambition to one based upon the sentiment of love, as in the case of Claude Melnotte in The Lady of Lyons, who in a similar way made himself worthy of his lady's love by his deeds of daring and his military accomplishments. Thus the play had the value politically which the author had intended, but was helped to success by the added motive of its "heart" interest.

Plays sometimes fail through inadequate performance, but rarely. Notwithstanding the drawbacks imposed on the author by a cast not perfect or ideal in its composition, a fairly intelligent

rendering will suggest its dramatic merits, if it has any. Countless failures are chargeable to the best stars and to the best ensemble performances, for no other reason than that the author's work was unworthy. Henry Irving, Ellen Terry, E. H. Sothern, Julia Marlowe, Richard Mansfield, Beerbohm Tree, George Alexander, in fact all great contemporary actors, have illuminated new works from time to time with their unquestioned talent, and yet failed to draw audiences. But good plays and good parts make good companies and good actors, and Shakespeare is responsible for more stars than all the other playwrights of all time because most of his plays contain more parts.

The masterly quality of Ibsen's plays in construction and character has made the Norwegian dramatist a model for advanced playwrights. But his subjects are usually unpleasant, and, as the success achieved by plays must be regarded from the point of view of the numbers who desire to see them, they are seldom a financial success.

AUGUSTUS THOMAS READING A PLAY
in the Manager's Office of the Old Lyceum, to Daniel Frohman, Fred Williams, and E. G. Unitt

Managers never produce Ibsen; they cannot afford the luxury except for a few special performances. But he appeals to the actor-manager or to the star actress, since he affords splendid opportunities for a display of talent in these pathological stage studies. But Ibsen is not a part of our regular theatrical system for the ennoblement or improvement of the public — as the drama rightly should be. No one goes to the theatre to be educated, though a wholesome play incidentally does educate, stimulate and inspire. The appeal is less to the head than to the heart — the emotions. The stage, equally with the pulpit, has this power, which, as an ethical force in modern life, can be made a healthful, living thing, or a base and sordid one. People go to the theatre to be interested.

CHAPTER THREE

THE A B C OF THE PLAY-BUILDER'S ART

I HAVE been asked on several occasions what is meant by a well-constructed play. Such a play is a matter of arithmetic, a piece of architecture, the human emotion being the foundation upon which the action or superstructure is built.

The Two Orphans is a marvel as a study of construction. It will be observed that there is not a line, scene or character in this drama that does not directly lead up to and contribute to the final outcome of the story. The laws of play architecture must be strictly followed — the unities observed. By "unities" is meant the conforming to a law of construction that was announced by Aristotle. He prescribed that a play should possess, first, the unity of time; second,

the unity of place; third, the unity of action — that all the incidents be directed to one catastrophe. These laws governed the classic drama, in which, in the absence of modern scenery and stage effects of the present, recourse could be had by an appeal to the intellect through an abundance of spoken verse. Such rules are not now observed except so far as the artistic unity prescribes that a play shall concern itself only with its own subject and its characters, and that everything else that might happen to the characters, aside from the fate in which they are involved, be eliminated. This sense of unity, however, is merely the artistic law of proportion which is often obeyed instinctively by authors who have not studied the science of play-building.

Sardou's Fédora well illustrates constructive skill. In the first act the Princess Fédora is brought face to face with the murderer of her fiancé — Loris Ipanoff. She vows revenge and invites him to her house. Having made sure that he is the guilty man she surrounds her house

with spies who shall carry him to his death. Then she lures him into a recital of the story. She now learns that Loris killed her own sweetheart because the latter had betrayed his (Loris) fiancée. This puts an entirely new phase on Fédora's scheme of revenge, since Loris has done exactly what she herself would have counselled him to do under the circumstances. But, having procured conditions designed to bring about Loris's death, she is in a quandary. If she leaves her room he will be killed. She must save him at any cost. Moreover, she has now fallen in love with him. Here comes the dramatic crux.

With a view to making her revenge complete, Fédora had already brought death into the family of Loris, and this scheme of the play is developed to the last curtain, when, just as Loris learns that Fédora is his long-sought enemy, she kills herself.

Camille, though much tabooed because of its questionable moral quality, is a wonderful drama of psychological import and great structural

THE DUEL SCENE IN SHERIDAN, BY PAUL M. POTTER
(Sam Sothern, Tully Marshall, Morton Selten, E. H. Sothern, Rowland Buckstone)

strength. No more powerful acts than the third and fourth in this play have been written in modern times. Theatrical they are, possibly ultra-sentimental, but they show masterful skill on the part of the dramatist, disclosing in its dramatic form the supremest test to which love can be subjected.

In practical form and spiritual import The Iron Master is a model of exquisite construction. Bronson Howard's Banker's Daughter quite as adroitly develops the same theme — that of a young woman, through a sense of duty or pique, marrying a man she does not love. Contact with the great love of the husband brings about a psychological revolution of her character, and she is won. The Wife (by Belasco and De Mille), is founded on the same theme though its treatment is different.

J. M. Barrie has shown marked versatility in the creation of such plays as The Little Minister, Quality Street, The Professor's Love Story, and Peter Pan. The success of The Little Minister

rests largely upon the interesting assortment of cleverly-drawn Scotch characters surrounding a pair of lovers, one of whom, Lady Babbie, masquerades as a gipsy and so wins the love of the local clergyman. Quality Street is a unique love story worked out through clean and charming incidents, of which the masquerade (the excellent but old stage device of pretending to be some one else) is also a feature.

Henry Arthur Jones, in The Silver King, developed an interesting proposition. Remorse for crime has been a popular subject for the poetic as well as for the philosophic writer. To bring this into a play — to show the influence and progress of sorrow and remorse consequent upon the commission of a crime gave an opportunity for portraying character that reached tragic intensity. Mr. Jones allowed the audience to see that the hero, Wilfred Denver, did not actually kill the murdered man, but that he, Denver, thought he had done so.

Stock companies, though we have no permanent

ones now, are organized with a view to fitting the exigencies of any dramatic story brought forward. Thus there is a certain proportion in the value of parts, without which a play would be an amorphous quantity. Stage stories usually have a hero and a heroine, a villain and a female villain, a first old man, who represents a fine type of the elderly father, a second old man, sometimes known as the rustic, and a first and second old woman, who have similiar relations. There are also the juvenile man and woman, who rank second to the leading male and female characters, and, for comedy, what are known as the ingénue and soubrette, opposite to male types and similar characters. Then there are what are known as character types, men and women who play intermediate rôles of special, either sinister or humorous, significance.

When a play is written for a star it must be so contrived by scenes or situations that the star may reveal his salient qualities either for serious or humorous work. It is clear that such plays are

not always the most artistic. Yet Shakespeare wrote with this end in view — Hamlet, Richard, Othello, Macbeth, being all star parts — and so did Sardou when he wrote Tosca, Fédora, Theodora for Bernhardt.

An author is greatly helped by having for such service an actor or actress of great power and versatility. It enables him to dig deeper and with more searching power into the depths of human nature, for such an artist, than if he wrote for a conventional company of merely adequate actors.

A good stage manager is also one of the most important factors. A good stage manager or play producer is rare. By producer is meant the man who combines in himself the art of the stage manager with the skill and discrimination to select the actors. A good stage manager is not merely a monitor who directs the actors in their movements, who tells them when to come on, how to make an effective stroke, and how to create a "situation." He must possess creative and interpretive powers. Action, of course, is

the basis of the staged play. Movement is the essential life of drama. But there may still be "action" and "movement" in an acted scene where there is no physical movement whatever by the characters. This depends upon the dramatic character of the spoken speech. On the other hand, a scene in which the characters are made to move about arbitrarily, to prevent the dialogue from seeming to drag, may still defeat its object.

Nevertheless, many a stage manager has been driven to devising movements for the characters to prevent the audience from realizing the length of the dialogue sometimes necessary to develop the motives, while too much dialogue frequently reveals weakness of construction. Where the spoken word, as in Shakespeare, is dramatic, as well as poetic, any concerted movement would prove distracting; as a too sumptuous scenic embellishment of the Bard's plays would do. Yet such over-elaboration has come within the modern experience of audiences.

A good stage manager must be a close observer of life. He must sympathize with the aim of the author and understand how to develop and graduate the scheme of the play with such truth and effective detail as to build up the climaxes with skill. He has to invent co-relative "business." A play is made up of a number of little plays or acted incidents in the scheme of the story, that separately contribute to the main denouément. While a stage manager may not be an actor, he will be able, if he has the correct instinct and knowledge, to convey every subtlety and shade of expression necessary to the actor. The actor is grateful for such assistance. With this help he, with his own creative skill, will build up the part to its furthest dimensions or to the limit of his own physical means of expression. And when an actor has apparently reached his limits, the stage manager's skill will enable him to carry forward by means of trick and effect what he may not be able to accomplish himself. But the actor is by no means regarded as a pup-

pet. The stage manager depends upon personal qualities in an actor that nature has bestowed upon him, and a shrewd director will study such an actor, and produce means by which the best in the artist may have full play — with all the care that a jockey will exercise to secure the maximum speed from his mount without breaking him. Many an acting scene has lost its significance because of the guiding hand that had not the inward sense to reveal its fullest significance.

While a good play cannot be killed altogether by imperfect stage management, it can be made so effective in all its phases by judicious handling that no doubt need exist of any of its merits, while its shortcomings can equally as well be skilfully mitigated. Many a play, in my own experience, has been helped to success by a skilful and picturesque treatment, not only in the manner of the acting, but in the general details of its environment.

On the other hand, a play is not always complete after its first performance. Clever stage

management, too, has frequently turned apparent first-night failures into success. The actors, too, are enabled, after the awful ordeal of a first night, to develop their own parts. Audiences who have been told by the press, or by witnesses, that certain plays have missed fire on their initial presentation, have found on a visit that the work thus improved, disclosed few if any of the demerits that they had expected to find.

CHAPTER FOUR

PLAYS AND PLAYERS ABROAD

A QUARTER of a century ago John T. Raymond, the famous comedian who starred in America as Colonel Sellers, whose dramatic slogan was the yet well-remembered "There's millions in it," decided to present this play, The Gilded Age, in London. The story goes that, directly after his arrival, he entered Gillig's American Exchange, then a famous resort and banking place for Americans, and saw that the office was well filled with many who knew the popular comedian. So, in a loud tone, he called to the manager: "I say, Gillig, how does one send money to America?" A week after his opening in that piece he again presented himself at the Exchange, and, slinking noiselessly over to Mr. Gillig's corner, with his hand shutting off his

tones, quietly whispered: "I say, Gillig, how does one get money from America?"

This experience, in its effect, is typical of the general experience of nearly every actor who has sought to win the bubble reputation from British audiences. Why is it that our best actors and some of our best plays have failed to score financially in London? The evidence goes to show that the press has been kind — more than kind. In some cases it has even been enthusiastic over the work of some of our American actors and actresses. They have won, too, the plaudits of their audiences; but the great body of theatre-goers has failed to respond. They could not have been ignorant of the presence of the American plays, yet all the skill in advertising and all the diplomatic arts of the press, both in their genuine approval and in their hospitable consideration, left the general public indifferent.

Nearly every prominent American actor is animated by an impulse to test an English verdict on his histrionic prowess. A suc-

cess in England would be a pleasing tribute to his artistic authority as an actor; but, it would mean little to him financially. As a means of home advertisement, such distinction is not to be ignored. For a play it would prove of special value, and its success abroad would react favourably upon its standing in this country. But no foreign endorsement of an American success is necessary, from a commercial point of view. Pride only may prompt a manager to tempt the British lion. The history of all American drama, save two or three, has been disastrous; and the story of John T. Raymond's solicitude about the monetary transfer system between the two countries, which I told at the outset of this chapter, is an experience common to our greatest actors and to those of more humble pretensions.

Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Florence's experience with The Almighty Dollar was similar to Raymond's. The artists were splendidly appreciated; the play not.

One distinguished example was the case of

Joseph Jefferson. After his success in America and Australia with Rip Van Winkle he went to London in 1865. There Boucicault rewrote this Sleepy Hollow drama, and, supported by a company of local favourites, the play ran successfully one hundred and seventy times. Jefferson not only was highly appreciated for his own beautiful and touching characterization of the idling, drunken, lovable scamp, but he had the advantage of the splendid management and support of the company of the Adelphi Theatre. He reappeared in London, ten years later, in the same play, with an equally popular success. Here was a case in which the actor was a great and crowning feature of a play that, though fantastic in its scheme, was full of humanity, and though based upon a preposterous ethical idea, was given life and charm chiefly through Jefferson's superb art. In spite of Jefferson's great success he brought away little, if any, money from his English ventures. In fact, Mr. Booth once said that no American



EDWIN BOOTH
In 1892

actor had ever brought away any money from England; and I dare say his friend, Mr. Jefferson, had no hesitation in imparting to him his own experiences.

Aided by well-known local favourites, in a similar way, another American actor, John E. Owens, famous in this country for his Solon Shingle and other American parts, was successful, in a popular way, in London, through the unique quality of his own performance — a distinct triumph over what was regarded there as a bad play. Owens is said to have paid three thousand dollars to have his play rewritten here, to make it acceptable to English taste. Despite its success, he returned home not overburdened with any financial reward.

Edwin Booth, our greatest actor, doubtless one of the greatest actors of all times, played three or four engagements in London. He appeared also in the British provinces. Here he repeated his artistic triumphs and had a satisfying financial reward. None of his London engagements were

financially profitable, despite the fact that he obtained the greatest distinction for his splendid impersonations. The greatest minds of England did him honour. Social honours poured in on him. The press, at first a little cool, finally lauded his achievements. But the public, the great public, while recognizing his great talents, remained loyal to their own tragedian — Irving — remained indifferent. His tour in Germany, however, was an ovation. The public, the press and the actors in the German companies rendered him the homage of their appreciation of his greatness as an actor. But when playing with Irving — in London at the English actor's invitation, as Othello and Iago on alternate nights, the business was enormous — the prices being nearly doubled. Irving's treatment of Booth was a splendid and characteristic act.

Lawrence Barrett's experience in London was financially tragic. He began his engagement with his famous work entitled Yorick's Love, with which he had appeared frequently in Amer-

ica; and while it had the highest claims to literary and dramatic distinction, and was written by William Dean Howells, it failed to gain the recognition of the English theatregoers. With his Richelieu he also failed. In this rôle they wanted only Henry Irving, who was enshrined as an idol. It was indeed a sad experience for Mr. Barrett, an actor so splendidly equipped with dramatic power, great nervous force and exalted ideals, wrecked on the shoals of English indifference. His failure reacted to some extent upon him here, as a blessing in disguise, for, in default of new material, he began the negotiation which led to the famous double starring combination with himself and Edwin Booth, which re-resulted in such great financial and artistic success for both.

John McCullough, famous in this country for his greatness in romantic tragedy, in England gained much fame for his Virginius, but little cash for his performances. His stay was brief; he made a pleasure jaunt of his English visit,

returned to America and repeated his successes in this country.

The elder Sothern, though an Englishman born, was so long in this country that he was, professionally at least, an American. During his later period, after years of precarious effort, he achieved his great success in this country as Lord Dundreary. He began his stage career in Boston, playing leading rôles at a salary of twenty-five dollars a week. Ten years later came his achievement as Lord Dundreary. He went to London in 1861 and appeared in this rôle at the Haymarket Theatre, Buckstone's famous house. The play was a fiasco the opening night. His characterization was immediately regarded as an affront to the "swells." The play was taken off after lingering on the stage for five or six weeks; but the character of Dundreary was talked about in drawing-rooms and in clubs. The humour of this exquisite portrayal then became apparent, and two months after its withdrawal he reappeared in the same play. The

laugh was a little late in coming, but it came at last; the play ran unremittingly for four hundred nights, and Sothern became the dramatic idol of the British public.

This experience reminds me of a famous saying of the American humourist, Marshall P. Wilder, who, when asked on an eastbound steamer why he was again going to London, said: "To get the laughs on my last year's jokes."

Mary Anderson appeared in London in 1884 as Parthenia, and was acclaimed by the press as a great beauty and praised for her splendid figure and her impressively sweet voice. The papers added, however, that the finer art of acting was a quality still lacking. She was, nevertheless, extremely popular and was the recipient of much social attention. On one occasion she was invited to meet the Prince of Wales at a luncheon, but she refused to meet His Highness. Her refusal made a world-wide sensation, and though she did not intend such a result, this action had the effect of filling the theatre with

people who wanted to see the bold young American girl who had deliberately refused this chance of royal recognition. After her season was over she took to heart the strictures on her acting and went to Paris to study. Afterward she went to London to continue her studies with the late J. F. Ryder, an old actor, who had also been teaching Adelaide Neilson. Therefore, when she reappeared, she had united to her own great personal attractions the added charm of a greater perfection in the art of acting. She had also the advantage of being supported by a splendid company of English actors, headed by Forbes-Robertson. She returned to America, appearing as Perdita in A Winter's Tale. Her great improvement as an actress was noticeable and she was exceptionally successful. When she finally retired from the stage, still young, and very much in love with her husband, she departed with the honours of an artist who had conquered.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE AUGUSTIN DALY COMPANY AND OTHERS

RICHARD MANSFIELD was another of our tragic actors who tried to wrest the laurels of victory from the British lion. His first appearance in London was as Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, which did not meet with success. His next appearance was with a lavish production of Richard III. In this he sank a small fortune.

In 1880 the popular American success, The Danites, with McKee Rankin, was given at Sadler's Wells Theatre. This, as in the case of Mr. Augustus Thomas's play, Arizona, later with the American company, created interest and drew the attention of theatregoers for the first time to American characters of Western life, but with only moderate financial success.

The Augustin Daly Company, then in possession of its Big Four — John Drew, Ada Rehan, James Lewis and Mrs. Gilbert — appeared year after year before it reached the profitable point; but this company created a furore by their splendid *ensemble* acting; and in its later Shakespearean productions, notably Katherine and Petruchio, it aroused the press and the public to some degree of enthusiasm. Mr. Daly's ventures in London were never with American plays, but always with the German adaptations in his American repertoire, except one or two Shakespearean productions.

William Gillette was probably one of the most popular American actors who has appeared in recent years. His play, entitled Held by the Enemy, and his farce comedy, Too Much Johnson, were produced by English actors and found generous recognition; he himself appeared abroad in the play, Secret Service. But his greatest achievement from the point of view of general success was with Sherlock Holmes,

at Irving's Lyceum Theatre. It ran about nine months to an average of about two thousand pounds a week of receipts. Mr. Gillette received not only an income out of this play, but a very large salary and a share of the profits of the production from his manager, Charles Frohman. In his company were two American actors. The others in the cast were the best obtainable from the London stage. The play was not an American story; neither did it treat of American characters, but was a skilful compound of a set of stories by Sir Conan Doyle. There was something unique in Mr. Gillette's manner of acting and in his personality, which was new to England. He became socially very popular, though he had no fondness for social life, and usually preferred the quiet of his own suite at his hotel.

On one occasion he told me that the Duchess of Manchester desired him to spend Sunday at her country home, some distance from the city. He said he was absolutely forced to accept an invitation that he sought politely to decline.

He had thought of a way out of it. He knew there was only a very early train out of London on Sundays. He explained that after his week's work he would require that morning for rest. She immediately brought forth another alternative. The express that left later for the north did not stop at her station. This he knew, and had urged that, in extenuation of his refusal.

"Oh, that's all right," she said. "I'll see that the express stops to let you off." So, perforce, he went. She had promised that only the members of her household and no week-end party would be present. When he arrived there, however, he was confronted not only by the family, but by a large and jolly week-end gathering of her friends. Still, he managed to enjoy himself.

Gillette's impression on the English was due as much to his personality as to his art. In fact, American personality is a big factor there. When Buffalo Bill first appeared in London he was lionized in the best social circles. Here was the typical American, they said — top boots, long

hair, sombrero and all the rest of it. A similar experience was had by Joaquin Miller, the Poet of the Sierras, who invaded even drawing-rooms in his top boots and unconventional accoutrements.

There are plays that are foredoomed to failure in London if they have not succeeded in America. Yet not all the American plays produced in London have been really representative of American taste. Those which have been successes in this country carry with them the prospect of some little hope. Take the case of Cynthia, a comedy by Hubert Henry Davis. It was first produced in this country and regarded as a failure. Afterward it was given in London with Ethel Barrymore, but the vogue of that work, short as it was, was solely due to the captivating personality of that actress.

Nat Goodwin and Maxine Elliott appeared frequently in London in their repertoire of American plays. Among these were The Cowboy and the Lady, and An American Citizen. The

former was something of a success, because Mr. Goodwin's fine comedy art was fully appreciated, as well as Miss Elliott's statuesque beauty, a startling and profitable asset. In Miss Elliott's numerous later ventures, however, her success was not repeated — no doubt owing to the quality of her plays.

On the other hand, two American actresses, Grace George and Eleanor Robson, were distinctly successful, the one with Divorçons, an Anglicized French play, and the other with Merely Mary Ann, an English character and a work by an English author.

Willie Collier is also credited with satisfying financial rewards with Richard Harding Davis's play, The Dictator, but it gained its end by its intensely comic quality and the humour of the star.

The experience of Charles Klein's greatest success, The Lion and the Mouse, was similar to other happenings with American plays. The first night was an ovation. The principals in

the play nightly had a flattering reception by audiences, and the press extolled their work in unmistakable terms of admiration. But the great British public remained dumb to their blandishments. The play was founded upon a scheme of judicial duplicity that, it was explained, was incomprehensible to them, and so its drama carried no conviction. Seldom had so much praise been lavished on acting and the play, but it was withdrawn in four weeks.

When Bronson Howard produced his comedy, Saratoga, in London, it was entirely rewritten by the late James Albery and made English. It was renamed Brighton, and presented successfully as an English play. When Howard subsequently produced his famous play, The Henrietta, it failed because the audience had never understood or seen this American type, nor could they understand the point of view; his humour was accepted seriously, and so the dramatic balance of the play was upset.

Robert Edeson in Strongheart, was yet another

disappointing experience. So was the interesting work Paid in Full. The Sothern-Marlowe season, two years ago, resulted in financial sorrow. The public preferred their own brand of Shakespeare. Henry Miller's disastrous experience in London with The Great Divide, for which the press again had many good words — especially for Mr. Miller's acting — is too recent to require detailed attention.

Among all these offerings, however, was one distinctly American work that ran over a year in London. This was Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch. Its great success was a surprise, though it has been explained that the caricature of American types of rural characters was regarded in London as representing what the Britisher supposed was the real American — not the American of Broadway with whom the Londoner was familiar, but the American character at large in his own country. Behind this simple statement lies, I think, the cause of most of the many failures. Since these lines

were written another American play, but with an entirely English cast, has been successful. It was Jimmy Valentine, but, as in the case of Sherlock Holmes, it dealt with a phase of crime — crime and criminals, as in the play of Raffles, being peculiarly alluring subjects — good when not overdone.

CHAPTER SIX

ENGLISH TASTE NOT INCLINED TO FOREIGN PLAYS

AMERICAN plays that represent social people of good standing brought to the Englishman no sense of reality. They regarded their own plays, and their manner of playing them, with more favour than the American article; and as for seeing well-bred people on the stage, the London theatre could offer varied assortments of well-bred modern life with more realistic skill, betraying a more congenial sense of "class," than the invader. And in this they are quite right. The average London company includes a larger percentage of average well-bred actors than do the American companies. Though native exponents of the histrionic art are capable and admirable actors, with certain qualifications more to the credit of the American, yet the Eng-

lishman by birth, education and environment excels in the fact that candidates for the stage come to it from well-to-do conditions in life; and many find on the stage a profession in which they can succeed. In America, on the other hand, there are inducements in so many other fields of endeavour that many men who might have adorned the stage, either as actors or as authors, are drawn to more congenial and more profitable fields of industry. America is a larger country, and opportunities for brains and ability abound to a much greater extent than in the old country.

England has been for years accustomed to drama as it was written for them by Englishmen. One prominent British author said to me once: "I don't care if my plays fail in America; I write for my own countrymen. It is their approval I seek." His attitude is typical.

The same conditions exist in France. The greatest pride a Frenchman feels is in work that represents the thought and feeling of a Frenchman. It is only such creative geniuses as Sardou,

Dumas and Bernstein who find popularity everywhere, though in England even they have frequently to be Anglicized. In the case of Bernstein's The Thief the entire spirit of the play was jeopardized by transforming all the characters into English types.

It is their predilection for the native drama that urges many English authors and English managers to Anglicize foreign works. Twenty-five to thirty years ago the English stage was, as in the days of Charles II, largely dependent upon the French. Popular French works were obtained and rigidly Anglicized; and frequently, in the stress of transplantation and change, they lost their essential significance. Hundreds of French plays were thus engrafted on the English stage. Buckstone, Boucicault, Robertson and Watts Phillips were fertile in this field. Several of them are credited with the authorship of about three hundred works each. Sardou's big tragedies have been successful through translation. His Dora had to be Anglicized by Clement

Scott before it was produced. Scott called it Diplomacy. La Famille Benoîton, another Sardou play, was made into A Fast Family by the late Ben Webster. Georges Ohnet's famous play, The Iron Master, was made into an English drama by Pinero. Rostand's Cyrano de Bergerac was a failure in England. That was a French subject. His great play, L'Aiglon, which was so great a success in America with Maude Adams, never found its way to the English stage. Both of these plays dealt with foreign subjects. French companies from Paris frequently play their repertoire in London in their own language. These performances find occasional favour because of their original casts.

Though the success of American plays might prove of great advantage to their subsequent exploitation in America, their failure in England would not really work against their prosperity here. It is a matter of geography, not of merit. The value of American successes in this country spreads to all parts of the United States, and

an English indorsement is a matter of artistic vanity, not a commercial need.

And so it is that English audiences are predisposed by thought, habit and certain insular qualities or custom — which is also a great factor in France and Germany — toward what concerns life from their own national point of view. There are times, however, when American plays have been known to please English audiences. These were plays in which American characters were satirized, as mentioned in the case of the caricatures in Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch. The American feminine rôle in Clyde Fitch's The Woman in the Case was pleasing because it aroused their derision against the woman. She was thought to be an American type. The embodiment of a noble type of American character is not so agreeable a subject. The Englishman sees the Americans crowd his famous restaurants and his capacious hotels; sees them flaunt their wealth in vulgar display in every direction. This has not served to enhance American chara-

acter as represented by serious American plays. The English have no liking for lessons in ethics, or dramatic preachments over idealized Americans — or any other foreigners.

Luckily for our stage the American is far more cosmopolitan in his taste. Plays of any nationality succeed in this country if they are based upon the universal element of human interest; but in England it is only the English drama that flourishes, or drama made into English, and the local or insular point of view cannot be reshaped.

The result of these experiences may modify future attempts on the part of the American actor to conquer England. In painting, in sculpture and in music our great artists find equal favour in Europe with their peers, but in the case of the drama it is more often a local institution, and it is doubtful whether foreign indifference to our plays or players can ever be wholly overcome. The drama is the one art among the four that does not altogether require a cultivated taste or an educated æstheticism for its appreciation;

and I must confess that our dramatic art has not yet been so crystallized into an institution as to warrant universal attention. It serves admirably in this country, and it is being steadily fostered by the extensive national taste for the drama, in which new writers find constant and generous opportunities. Whether any efforts to ingraft our drama or our actors upon the foreign stage are worth while, these experiences will show; but so far the record, in the main, is one of failure.

CHAPTER SEVEN

A FINAL CHAPTER ON THE DRAMA OF TO-DAY

THE degeneracy of the stage has been a subject of woe since the days of Shakespeare. I dare say that this is why the drama is so great a subject. That is why, when a really sound, sensible play makes its appearance, it is hailed with delight by press and public. But I am not one of the numerous advocates who look for the purely educational quality in plays. A play, to prove popular — and by popular I mean plays liked and patronized by the multitude — must be sound drama, and drama of the most convincing kind. By drama, I mean a transcript of life, either in its best form, as it exists; or in its ideal form, as life ought to be, embodying a wholesome story that is exalting in quality and uplifting in its effect. By its

appeal to the imagination and the emotions, an element of ethical value is revealed that may or may not carry an educational quality; but if presented purely as an appeal to the intellect, it is doomed to failure — not the failure of impotent endeavour, of faulty construction, but the failure to command the attention of the large public, which should be the aim of the theatre. Yet such a play can enforce unobtrusively a lesson taught by a mimic experience that can be salutary and effective.

It is the multitude that makes a stage work valuable. The intelligence of the crowd is not as keen as the discrimination of the individual, for the crowd is more easily swayed by the display of feeling, passion and emotion, and so becomes more demonstrative. Literature as an evidence and revelation of good writing, is not to be barred; but the spoken language must be language that can be acted, that is the outgrowth and expression of the moods and qualities of the stage personages.

The drama to-day may not stand on so exalted

a plane as many desire. Its general character is less concerned with so-called fine writing or intellectual effort than were the plays of the early periods of the drama, when the art of acting had graver significance than that concerned in the story-telling plays of to-day. Then, literature of all kinds was not so readily accessible to all classes as it is now, and the actors were depended upon to spout with vehement effect, for it was at the theatre the public obtained more frequently its acquaintance, its chief knowledge of many great writers.

The character of the modern theatre has gradually changed all this. The stage of the present does not protrude itself into the auditoriums, as it did in the early days, but has been withdrawn within the proscenium to make way for "picture" plays, rather than "platform" or rhetorical exhibitions; and the declamation of the actor had given way to the *ensemble* development of the story.

The modern methods of lighting enable the

auditors to observe with exceeding clearness the faces of the actors; and so the illuminative "soliloquy" has been done away with as being a form of bad art and lame construction. The skill of the author is united with the art of the actor, to represent more convincingly the illusion which a good play should create. In this way the stage reveals now more lucidly the art of the drama and is devoted less to the display of spoken dialogue or verse, for its aim and purpose is to unfold a struggle of the mind, of will, of character, or events which include the picturing of the emotions and feelings in a state of conflict.

The stage gives us, therefore, what is graphic. It depicts society in its various phases; it is devoted to the study of and manifestation of life revealed by its contrasting classes that people the upper and lower stratum of humanity, and concerns itself with the keen and searching problems of our own life.

Its appeal should come swift as a vivid human document transcribed with a keen dramatic

hand, from life, not offered as a polemical treatise. For the latter, there is a public, but it is a limited one, and is the monopoly of students and scholars. Not Byron, Wordsworth, Swinburne, Tennyson or Browning, with their great faculties, could view life in the way to conform to the objective point of the real playwright. They are for the study, not the stage. Yet one would not deny them the dramatic form in which to convey their conceptions. Visualizing their characters on the stage of a theatre before an alert, listening audience requires the medium of another art. But the dramatic instinct in mankind is fostered by the drama of action and of character, and of incident contributing to this action.

APPENDIX

HISTORY OF THE LYCEUM THEATRE BY DATES OF THE PRODUCTIONS OF PLAYS

The "Old" Lyceum Theatre was erected by Steele Mackaye, and opened on Monday, April 6, 1885, with his play entitled Dakolar.

During Mr. Mackaye's management engagements were played by Minnie Maddern, Richard Mansfield, Helen Dauvray and Frank Mayo.

In May, 1885, Daniel Frohman assumed the management of the house.

September, 1886 — The Main Line, by H. C. De Mille.

October, 1886 — Miss Fortescue's Season

December, 1886 — Helen Dauvray's Second Season.

May 3, 1887 — The Highest Bidder, with E. H. Sothern. (Daniel Frohman's first regular production.)

September 19, 1887 — The Great Pink Pearl, by Cecil Raleigh, and Editha's Burglar, with E. H. Sothern and Elsie Leslie.

November 1, 1887 — The Wife, by Belasco and De Mille. (First appearance of Daniel Frohman's Stock Company.)

August 21, 1888 — Lord Chumley, with E. H. Sothern.

November 13, 1889 — Sweet Lavender, by A. W. Pinero.

March 18, 1889 — The Marquise, by Sardou.

March 29, 1889 — Revival of The Wife.

August 20, 1889 — Lord Chumley, with E. H. Sothern.

October 21, 1889 — Our Flat.

November 19, 1889 — The Charity Ball, by David Belasco and H. C. De Mille.

August 26, 1890 — The Maister of Woodbarrow, by Jerome K. Jerome, with E. H. Sothern.

November 11, 1890 — The Idler, by Haddon Chambers.

January 19, 1891 — Nerves, by Comyss Carr.

April 6, 1891 — Old Heads and Young Hearts.

August 31, 1891 — The Dancing Girl, by Henry Arthur Jones, with E. H. Sothern.

November 16, 1891 — Lady Bountiful, by A. W. Pinero.

January 12, 1892 — Squire Kate, by Robert Buchanan.

March 14, 1892 — Merry Gotham, by Elizabeth Marbury.

April 25, 1892 — The Gray Mare, by George R. Sims and Cecil Raleigh.

August 16, 1892 — Captain Lettarblair, by Marguerite Merington, with E. H. Sothern.

December 5, 1892 — Americans Abroad, by Sardou.

April 3, 1893 — The Guardsman, by Sims and Raleigh.

September 5, 1893 — Sheridan, by Paul Potter, with E. H. Sothern.

November 20, 1893 — An American Duchess, by Clyde Fitch.

January 8, 1894 — Our Country Cousins, by Paul Potter.

February 19, 1894 — The Amazons, by A. W. Pinero.

August 27, 1894 — The Victoria Cross, by Paul Potter, with E. H. Sothern.

November 20, 1894 — A Woman's Silence, by Sardou.

December 29, 1894 — The Case of Rebellious Susan, by Henry Arthur Jones.

March 12, 1895 — An Ideal Husband, by Oscar Wilde.

April 16, 1895 — Fortune, by Fred Horner.

September 4, 1895 — The Prisoner of Zenda, by Anthony Hope, with E. H. Sothern.

November 25, 1895 — The Home Secretary, by R. C. Carton.

January 6, 1896 — The Benefit of the Doubt, by A. W. Pinero.

February 10, 1896 — The Prisoner of Zenda, (revival) with Stock Company, including J. K. Hackett.

September 1, 1896— An Enemy to the King, by R. N. Stephens, with E. H. Sothern.

December 1, 1896 — The Courtship of Leonie, by H. V. Esmond, and first appearance of Mary Mannering.

December 14, 1896 — The Late Mr. Castello, by Sydney Grundy.

January 25, 1897 — The First Gentleman of Europe, by Mrs. Burnett and George Fleming.

March 8, 1897 — The Mayflower, by Louis N. Parker.

April 19, 1897 — The Mysterious Mr. Bugle, by Madeleine Lucette Ryley, with Annie Russell.

September 6, 1897 — Change Alley, by L. N. Parker and Murray Carson, with E. H. Sothern.

October 11, 1897 — The Lady of Lyons, with E. H. Sothern and Virginia Harned.

November 23, 1897 — The Princess and the Butterfly, by A. W. Pinero.

January 24, 1898 — The Tree of Knowledge, by R. C. Carton.

April 11, 1898 — The Moth and the Flame, by Clyde Fitch, with Herbert Kelcey and Effie Shannon.

September 1, 1898 — The Adventure of Lady Ursula, by Anthony Hope, with Mr. and Mrs. Sothern.

October 31, 1898 — A Colonial Girl, by Grace L. Furniss and Abby Sage Richardson, with E. H. Sothern.

November 22, 1898 — Trelawny of the Wells, by A. W. Pinero. First appearance of Hilda Spong and Harry Woodruff.

March 13, 1899 — Americans at Home, by Abby Sage Richardson and Grace L. Furniss.

March 29, 1899 — John Ingerfield, by Jerome K. Jerome.

April 10, 1899 — Rupert of Hentzau, by Anthony Hope, with James K. Hackett.

May 9, 1899 — His Excellency the Governor, by Captain R. Marshall.

September 7, 1899 — Miss Hobbs, by Jerome K. Jerome, with Annie Russell.

November 27, 1899 — The Lyceum Stock Company moves to Daly's Theatre.

January 22, 1900 — The Surprises of Love, by Paul Bilhaud and Michael Carrè, with Elsie De Wolfe.

February 26, 1900 — My Daughter-In-Law, by Fabrice Carrè and Paul Bilhaud, with Ellaine Terriss and Seymour Hicks.

April 30, 1900 — Border-Side, by Mrs. E. F. Riggs, with Virginia Calhoun.

September 5, 1900 — A Royal Family, by Captain Marshall, with Annie Russell.

February 4, 1901 — Richard Savage, by Madeleine Lucette Ryley, with Henry Miller.

February 25, 1901 — The Lash of a Whip, by Maurice Hennequin and Georges Duval.

April 1, 1901 — On and Off, by Alexander Bisson.

September 10, 1901 — The Forest Lovers, by A. E. Lancaster, with Bertha Galland.

October 12, 1901 — The Love Match, by Sydney Grundy, with Bertha Galland.

December 4, 1901 — The Girl and the Judge, by Clyde Fitch, with Annie Russell.

March 22, 1902 — End of the Lyceum Theatre.

DALY'S THEATRE UNDER DANIEL FROHMAN'S MANAGEMENT

September 13, 1899 — The King's Musketeer, by Henry Hamilton, with E. H. Sothern.

October 12, 1899 — The Song of the Sword, by Leo Ditrichstein, with E. H. Sothern.

November 27, 1899 — Installation of the Lyceum Stock Co., The Manœuvres of Jane, by Henry Arthur Jones.

February 6, 1897 — The Ambassador, by John Oliver Hobbs (Mrs. Craigie).

February 20, 1899 — Wheels Within Wheels, by R. C. Carton. (At Madison Square Theatre, with members of Stock Company.)

March 20, 1899 — An Interrupted Honeymoon, by F. Kinsey Piele.

April 9, 1899 — Trelawny of the Wells, by A. W. Pinero (revival one week).

April 16, 1899— Wheels Within Wheels.

April 23, 1899 — The Runaway Girl (musical comedy; revival).

September 5, 1900 — The Rose of Persia. (Opera by Sullivan and Hood.)

October 1, 1901 — San Toy (musical comedy).

November 26, 1901 — The Man of Forty, by Walter Frith, with the Stock Company.

December 21, 1901 — Lady Huntsworth's Experiment, by R. C. Carton, with Stock Company.

March 4, 1901 — San Toy (revival).

September 16, 1901 — The Messenger Boy, with Jas. T. Powers (musical comedy).

January 7, 1902 — Frocks and Frills, by Sydney Grundy, with Stock Company.

February 26, 1902 — Notre Dame, by Paul M. Potter.

END OF THE STOCK COMPANY REGIME

April 7, 1902 — San Toy (revival).

May 12, 1902 — King Dodo, with Raymond Hitchcock.

September 22, 1902 — A Country Girl (musical comedy).

December 29, 1902 — The Billionaire (musical farce).

March 30, 1903 — The Jewel of Persia, with Jas. T. Powers. (Musical comedy.)

April 13, 1903 — The Starbucks.

May 4, 1903 — My Lady Peggy, by Fannie A. Matthews, with Cecil Spooner.

September 1, 1903 — Three Little Maids (musical comedy).

November 19, 1903 — A Japanese Nightingale (drama) with Margaret Illington.

January 5, 1904 — My Lady Molly (musical comedy).

January 18, 1904 — Sergeant Kitty, with Virginia Earle.

February 15, 1904 — Glittering Gloria.

March 7, 1904 — Twelfth Night. Ben Greet Company, with Edith Wynne Matthison.

April 4, 1904 — The Prince of Pilsen.

May 2, 1904 — The Crown Prince, with Jas. K. Hackett.

September 1, 1904 — The School Girl, with Edna May.

October 24, 1904 — The Cingalee (musical comedy).

November 21, 1904 — Nance O'Neill in repertoire.

December 26, 1904 — The School Girl.

January 16, 1905 — The Duchess of Dantzig (musical comedy).

April 17, 1905 — San Toy (revival).

August 28, 1905 — The Catch of the Season, with Edna May.

November 27, 1905 — The Toast of the Town, with Viola Allen.

January 1, 1905 — The Crossing.

January 8, 1905 — Cashel Byron's Confession, by Bernard Shaw.

Jan 22, 1905 — The Fascinating Mr. Vanderveldt, by Arthur Sutro, with Ellis Jeffreys.

March 5, 1905 — The Embassy Ball, by Augustus Thomas, with Lawrance D'Orsay.

April 23, 1905 — The Optimist.

April 30, 1905 — Cousin Louisa.

(End of Daniel Frohman's management.)

CASTS OF FAMOUS FIRST NIGHTS

May 3d, 1887, First Performance

THE HIGHEST BIDDER

A New Comedy in Three Acts, by MADDISON MORTON and ROBERT REECE

CAST OF CHARACTERS

Lawrence Thornhill, of The Larches ..... J. W. Pigott
Bonham Cheviot, of The Firs, His Neighbour ..... W. J. Le Moyne
Sir Muffin Struggles, a Philanthropist ... Rowland Buckstone
Sir Evelyn Grane, Baronet, etc. ..... Herbert Archer
Joseph, Servant to Thornhill ..... Walter Bellows
Jack Hammerton, of Hammerton, Mallett & Co., London ..... E. H. Sothern
Parkyn, His Valet ..... W. A. Faversham
Frank Wiggins ..... Percy Sage
Sergeant Downey ..... Alfred Young
Bill, His Assistant ..... Maurice Clyde
Servant ..... Francis Raynes
Rose Thornhill ..... Belle Archer
Mrs. Honiton Lacy ..... Lizzie Duroy
Louisa, Her Daughter ..... Kittie Wilson
Servant ..... Miss Kline

Act I. — Breakfast Room of The Larches .....The Bidder

Act II. — Salesroom at Hammerton, Mallett & Co's., London .....The High Bidder

Act III. — Scene 1. Exterior of The Larches. Sunset
Scene 2. The Glade. Twilight.
Scene 3. Same as Scene 1. Moonlight. The Highest Bidder.

Intermissions — Ten Minutes after each Act.

The Play edited by and under the stage direction of Mr. Belasco.

New Scenery by E. G. Unitt.

November 1st, 1887. First Time

A New Play Written for This Theatre, Entitled

THE WIFE

By David Belasco and Henry C. De Mille

CAST OF CHARACTERS

By The New Lyceum Theatre Company

John Rutherford, of the U. S. Senate.....Herbert Kelcey
Matthew Culver, in Politics.....Nelson Wheatcroft
Robert Grey, Attorney-at-law.....Henry Miller
Silas Truman of the Produce Exchange.....Charles Walcot
Major Homer Q. Putnam, Compelled to Take Life Easily.....W. J. Le Moyne
Jack Dexter, Columbia '88.....Charles S. Dickson
Mr. Randolph, Rutherford's Private Secretary.....Walter Bellows
Helen Truman, An Only Daughter.....Georgia Cayvan
Lucille Ferrant, From New Orleans.....Grace Henderson
Mrs. Bellamy Ives, in Charities.....Mrs. Chas. Walcot
Kitty Ives, Coming Out.....Louise Dillon
Mrs. Amory, Junior Member of Truman & Co.....Mrs. Thos. Whiffen
Agnes, Helen's Maid .....Vida Croly

Act I. Rear View of Truman Villa, Newport, July
The Proposal.

Act II. Rutherford's Home, New York, October. The
Lover.

Act III. Tableau I — Reception Room at Mrs. Dexter's,
Washington. February. The Husband.

Tableau II. Library in Rutherford's House,
Washington. Same Evening. The
Marriage Tie.

Act IV. Library in Rutherford's House. April. The
Wife.

The Entire Production Under the Stage Direction of the
Authors.

The Scenery, Costumes, Furniture, etc., designed for this
play by Mr. W. H. Day.

Incidental Music by Puerner. Scenery painted by E. G.
Unitt. Mechanism, etc., by T. Gossman.

August 31st, 1891. First Performance of

THE DANCING GIRL

By Henry Arthur Jones

The Duke of Guisebury, (Valentine Danecourt)	E. H. Sothern
Hon. Reginald Slingsby	Morton Selten
David Ives	Augustus Cooke
John Christison	Wright Huntington
Mr. Crake	Odell Williams
Stephen Graunt	H. W. Montgomery
Goldspink	Rowland Buckstone
Augustus Cheevers	L. Clarke
Charles	Frank Leiden
Capt. Leddra	W. H. Pope
Herr Poniatouski	Mr. Montgomery
Drusilla Ives	Virginia Harned
Faith Ives	Bessie Tyree
Sybil Crake	Jenny Dunbar
Lady Bawtry	Mrs. Kate Pattison-Selten
Lady Brislington	Mary Elliott
Lady Poperoach	Miss Hern
Mrs. Christison	Mrs. Josephine Laurens
Mrs. Leddra	Mrs. Lauer
Mrs. Graunt	Clara Daymer
Sister Beatrice	Blanche Weaver

Ladies and Gentlemen by Misses Foster, Ewing, Hain, Parry, Kingston, Dodd, Marlowe, Hall, Perry, Cotton, Clayton, Rolfe, and Messrs. Miller, Crass, Hopples, Hammersley, Marshall, Dwyer, Cranston, Roe and others.

Act I. The Beautiful Pagan. Scene — The Isle of St. Endellion (Scilly Island).

(Fifteen months pass.)

Act II. The Broken Bowl. Scene — Villa at Richmond.

Act III. The Last Feast. Scene — Guisebury House, St. James' Park, London. (Two years pass.)

Act IV. The Desired Haven. Scene — The Isle of St. Endellion.

September 4th, 1895. First Performance of

THE PRISONER OF ZENDA

Founded on Anthony Hope's Famous Novel by EDWARD ROSE

CHARACTERS IN PROLOGUE

Prince Rudolf, The Red Elphberg, Heir-apparent to the Throne of Ruritania.....E. H. Sothern
Duke Wolfgang, The Black Elphberg, His Cousin.....Arthur R. Lawrence
Gilbert, Earl of Rassendyll.....Howard Gould
Horace Glyn, a Young Diplomatist.....Guido Marburg
Jeffreys, an Old Servant.....W. L. Branscombe
Giffen, a Servant.....Royden Erlynne
Amelia, Countess of Rassendyll.....Bertha Bartlett

Period of Prologue, 1733.

Scene — Lord Rassendyll's House in London, 1733.
The Rassendylls — with a word on the Elphbergs.

CHARACTERS IN THE PLAY

Rudolf the Fifth, The Red Elphberg, King of Ruritania / Rudolf Rassendyll, a Young Englishman — E. H. Sothern
Michael, Duke of Strelsau, The Black Elphberg, The King's Cousin.....A. R. Lawrence
Colonel Sapt, an Old Soldier.....Rowland Buckstone
Fritz Von Tarlenheim.....Howard Gould
Captain Hentzau / Detchard — followers of Duke Michael — Daniel Jarrett / Morton Selten

Bertram Bertrand, a Young English Artist....Sam Sothern
Marshal Strakencz.....C. P. Flockton
Lorenz Teppich, Chancellor of Ruritania....Henry Talbot
Franz Teppich, Mayor of Ruritania, His Brother.....W. B. Woodall
Lord Topham, an English Ambassador...W. L. Branscombe
Ludwig, Toni } Retainers at Tarlenheim { Charles Arthur, R. Erlynne
Josef.....John J. Collins
Princess Flavia.....Grace Kimball
Antoinette De Mauban.....Marie D. Shotwell
Frau Teppich, Wife of Franz.....Kate Pattison-Selten
Countess Von Strofzin.....Miss Dibdin
Countess Von Riesberg.....Miss Drew
Ladies, Courtiers, Soldiers, Ambassadors, etc., etc.

Period of the Play — To-day.

Act I. In the Forest near Zenda, 1894.
Concerning the colour of men's hair.

Act II. The Winter Palace at Strelsau.
A Fair Cousin and a Dark Brother.

Act III. At the Castle at Tarlenheim.
The King can do no Wrong.

Act IV. The Castle of Zenda.
If Love were All!

Produced under the Stage Direction of Mr. Sothern.

Scenery by Wm. Hawley. Music by Frank Howson.

Costumes by Dazian.

November 23rd, 1897

An Original Modern Comedy, in Five Acts

THE PRINCESS AND THE BUTTERFLY

By Arthur W. Pinero

Those who love deep, never grow old

THE PERSONS IN THE PLAY

Sir George Lamorant.....James K. Hackett
Maj.-Gen. Sir Robert Chichele, K. C.B. ....Charles Walcot
Edward Oriel .....Edward Morgan
Maxime Demailly (His first appearance here).....William Courtleigh
Hon. Charles Denstroude.....Frank R. Mills
Mr. St. Roche.....Felix Morris
Lieut.-Col. Arthur Eave.....George Alison
Mr. Adrian Mylls.....H. S. Taber
Mr. Bartley Levan.....Henry Muller
Mr. Percival Ord.....Seymour George
Faulding.....John Findlay
Fay Zuliani.....Mary Mannering
Lady Ringstead.....Mrs. Charles Walcot
Lady Chichele.....Mrs. Thomas Whiffen
Annis.....Katharine Florence
Mrs. St. Roche.....Norah Lamison
Mrs. Ware. .....Alison Skipworth
Mrs. Marsh.....Grace Root
Blanche Oriel.....Helen Macbeth
Mrs. Sabiston.....Nina Morris
Catharine.....Evelyn Carter
The Princess Pannonia.....Julie Opp

Stage direction of Mr. Fred. Williams.

November 22nd, 1898. First performance in America of

TRELAWNY OF THE WELLS

An Original Comedietta, in Four Acts, by ARTHUR W. PINERO

THE PERSONS OF THE PLAY

Tom Wrench	Of the Bagnigge-Wells Theatre	Edward J. Morgan
Ferdinand Gadd		Wm. Courtleigh
James Telfer		Geo. C. Boniface
Augustus Colpoys		Charles W. Butler
Rose Trelawny		Mary Mannering
Avonia Bunn		Elizabeth Tyree
Mrs. Telfer, (Miss Violet)		Mrs. Charles Walcot

Imogen Parrott, of the Royal Olympic Theatre.....Hilda Spong

O'Dwyer, Prompter at the Pantheon Theatre.....Grant Stewart

Mr. Denzil	Of the Pantheon Theatre	Thos. Wilson
Mr. Mortimer		Louis Albionon
Mr. Hunston		Douglas J. Wood
Miss Brewster		Maude Knowlton
Hallkeeper at the Pantheon		J. Hollingworth

Non-Theatrical Folk

Vice-Chancellor Sir William Gower, Kt...Charles Walcot

Arthur Gower	His Grandchildren	Henry Woodruff
Clara De Foenix		Helma Nelson

Miss Trafalgar Gower, Sir William's Sister...Ethel Hornick

Captain De Foenix, Clara's Husband.....H. S. Taber

Mrs. Mossop, a Landlady.....Mrs. Thos. Whiffen

Mr. Ablett, a Grocer.....John Findley

Charles, a Butler.....W. B. Royston

Sarah, a Maid.....Blanche Kelleher

Act I. Mr. and Mrs. Telfer's Lodgings, at No. 2 Brydon Crescent, Clerkenwell. May.

Act II. At Sir William Gower's, in Cavendish Square June.

Act III. Again in Brydon Crescent. December.

Act IV. On the stage of the Pantheon Theatre. A few days later.

Period.— Somewhere in the early sixties.

Stage Direction of Fred. Williams. Incidental Music by Frank Howson.

Costumes from designs by Percy Anderson, Esq.

Scenery by E. G. Unitt.

INDEX

A

Accidents, at rehearsals, incorporated in plays, 42-43, 142, 145-147
Achurch, Janet, 29-30
Adams, Maude, 74-75, 193
Adrienne Lecouvreur, 113-114
Adventure of Lady Ursula, The, 72, 83
Advertising, unique methods of, 17-18
Alexander, George, 17, 55, 85, 158
Allen, Viola, 6, 27-28
Amazons, The, 57, 64, 76
American Academy of Dramatic Arts, 77
American Claimant, The, 50
Americans Abroad, 66-67, 75
Anderson, Mary, 17, 48, 179
Anglin, Margaret, 82-83
Aristotle, his law of play construction, 160
Arizona, 181
Arms and the Man, 29
Ashwell, Lena, 124
Audiences, in 1887 and present day, 54-56
Augustin Daly Company, 182

B

Baconian Theory, why Thespians disbelieve in it, 94
Banker's Daughter, The, 47, 163
Barrett, Lawrence, 134, 176-177
Barrie, J. M., 163
Barron, Charles, 27
Barrymore, Ethel, 81, 185
Barrymore, Georgie Drew, 81-82
Belasco, David, 8-10, 12, 32-33
Bellew, Kyrle, 78
Bellows, Walter C., 34, 58, 80
Benefit of the Doubt, The, 58
Bernstein, Henri, 192
Bishop, Charles B., 23-25
Bispham, David, 122
Boniface, George C., 62
Booth, Edwin, 19-22, 50, 134, 174-176
Boston Museum Company, 27

Boucicault, Dion, 87-90, 92, 135, 141, 174, 192
Bozenta, Count, 115
Brighton, 187
Buckland, Wilfrid, 80
Buckstone, John Baldwin, 102-103, 178, 192
Buffalo Bill, 17, 184
Burbank, A. P., 50
Burroughs, Marie, 28
Butler, Charles, 63

C

Called Back, 27
Calvé, Mlle., 124-126
Cameron, Rhoda, 69
Camille, 162
Campbell, Bartley, 47-49
Campbell, Mrs. Pat, 56, 122
Campf, Wm., 132
Candida, 29, 30
Captain Lettarblair, 75, 146
Carmen, 124
Carton, R. C., 62, 69
Case of Rebellious Susan, The, 68, 75-76
Castle, Agnes and Egerton, 73
Casts of Famous First Nights 216-226
Cayvan, Georgia, 34-35, 54, 58, 64-66, 76, 78-79, 91
Chambers, Haddon, 85
Charity Ball, The, 33, 75, 89
Clemens, Samuel L., 49-52
Collier, Constance, 76
Collier, William, 186
Colonel Sellers, 49-50
Coman, Morgan, 122
Cook, Augustus, 58
Copyright laws, improvement in, 64
Couldock, C. W., 79
Courtenay, William, 122
Courtleigh, William, 59, 62
Courtship of Leonie, The, 76
Crane, William H., 38-41
Croly, Vida, 34
Crosman, Henrietta, 35-36, 84-85
Cynthia, 185
Cyrano de Bergerac, 193

D

Dakolar, 6, 27
Dalton, Charles, 124
Daly, Augustin, 5, 84; Company, 182
Daly's Theatre, home of Lyceum Stock Co., 131; under Daniel Frohman's management, 212-215
Dancing Girl, The, 60, 70, 75, 80
Danites, The, 181
Dauvray, Helen, 6, 15, 40
Death of Rollo, The, 24
De Mille, H. C., 32-33
De Mille, William, 77
Denise, 124
De Pachmann, Vladimir, 122
Depew, Chauncey, 38-39
De Reszkes, the, 125
Dickson, Charles S., 34-35
Dictator, The, 186
Dillon, Louise, 34, 54

Drama, the bane of, 46; a local institution, 191-195; does not require cultivated taste, 195; must be convincing to win popularity, 197; character of modern, 198, 201
Dramatists' Club, founded by Bronson Howard, 45
Dress rehearsals, not indicative of play's success, 14
Drew, John, 109, 182
Dumas, Alexander, 192
Duplicate companies, beginning of system of, 26

E

Edeson, Robert, 187
Elliott, Maxine, 185-186
Elliston, Grace, 35, 84
England, American plays in, 171-180
Erminie, 147
Esmeralda, 28, 89

F

Fast Family, A, 193
Faust, 60
Faversham, William A., 34, 36, 79
Fawcett, George, 77
Fédora, 26, 161, 166
Findlay, John, 58-59, 63
Finney, Jameson Lee, 131
First Nights, Casts of Famous, 216–226
Fischer, Alice, 77
Fiske, Mrs., 28, 80, 81
Fitch, Clyde, 49, 131, 194
Florence, Katherine, 35, 59, 64
Florence, Mr. and Mrs. W. J., 173
Forbes-Robertson, 17, 58, 180
Ford, Hugh, 77
Forrest, Edwin, 134
Frohman, Charles, 7, 75, 81, 183; Company, 73
Frohman, Daniel, advance agent of "one-night-stand" show, 3-4; early ambitions, 3; organization of Lyceum Theatre Stock Co., 4; manager of Lyceum Theatre, 6; engagement of Sothern, 8; securing of Mr. Belasco as stage manager of Lyceum, 9; business director of Madison Square Theatre, 9; experiences with first play, 12-14; engagement of Charles B. Bishop, 23, and William Gillette, 25; institution of system of duplicate companies, 26; engagement of Annie Russell and Viola Allen, 27-28; experiences with Richard Mansfield, 28-31; formation of permanent stock company, 32; first play with new stock company, 36-40; experiences with Mark Twain, 49-52, with Pinero and his plays, 54-65; production of plays by

Sardou, Henry Arthur Jones, and Anthony Hope, 66-73; starring of James K. Hackett, 71-73, and Maude Adams, 74-75; reminiscences of the '80's, 78-86; memories of Boucicault, 87-94; review of Hamlet, 95-101; experiences with the Kendals, 102-112; memories of Madame Modjeska, 112-126; presentation of Kubelik, 127-131; removal of stock company to Daly's, 75, 131; opening of New Lyceum, 132; views on play composition and construction, 139-170; reminiscences of plays and players abroad, 171-196; comments on the drama of to-day, 197-201

G

Galland, Bertha, 74
George, Grace, 186
Gilbert, Mrs., 109, 131, 182
Gilded Age, The, 181
Gillette, William, 4, 25, 26, 49, 182-184
Gillig's American Exchange, 171
Girl and the Judge, The, 131
Glendenning, John, 122
Goodwin, Nat, 185-186
Gottschalk, Ferdinand, 65
Grattan, Stephen, 69
Great Divide, The, 188
Grimston, Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Kendal (see Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Kendal).

H

Hackett, James K., 35-36, 59, 71-73
Hale, Walter, 69, 80
Hamlet, dramatic structure of, 95-98; rehearsal by Shakespeare, 99-100; success despite defiance of accepted conventions, 148-149
Harbury, Charles, 58
Hare, John, 58, 104
Harned, Virginia, 80
Harrison, Bertram, 77
Hazel Kirke, 26, 78-79
Held by the Enemy, 26, 182
Henderson, Grace, 34
Henrietta, The, 38, 40, 47, 187
Highest Bidder, The, 9-10, 12-13, 16-18
Hill, Barton, 122
Hilliard, Robert, 131
His Excellency the Governor, 81
Hope, Anthony, 71-73
Hornick, Ethel, 35, 62
House, Edward H., 52
Howard, Bronson, 6, 25, 38, 40-41, 44-47, 79, 126, 163, 187
Howells, William Dean, 50, 52-53, 177

I

Ibsen, Henrik, a model for advanced playwrights, 158-159
Idler, The, 75-85
If I Were King, 156
Illington, Margaret, 122, 132
In Spite of All, 28
Ironmaster, The, 106, 163, 193
Irving, Sir Henry, 17, 60, 105, 158, 176-177
Irving, Isabel, 69, 76

J

James, Louis, 122
Jefferson, Joseph, 149, 174
Jimmy Valentine, 189
Jones, Henry Arthur, 60, 68-70, 164

K

Kelcey, Herbert, 34-35, 54, 58, 65, 78, 91
Kellard, John E., 122
Kendal, Madge (Mrs. W. H.) 56, 102-112
Kendal, W. H., 17, 103-112
Klein, Charles, 49, 186
Krehbiel, H. E., 129, 130
Kubelik, 127-131

L

Lady Bountiful, 57-58
Lady Huntworth's Experiment, 62
Lady of Lyons, The, 103, 157
L'Aiglon, 193
Le Moyne, W. J., 13, 34-35, 37, 54, 58, 79, 91
Leslie, Elsie, 51
Lester Wallack Company, 3, 5, 78
Lewis, Horace, 122
Lewis, James, 182
Lion and the Mouse, The, 186
Little Minister, The, 163-164
Loftus, Cecilia, 131-132
London, mission to, 17; American plays in, 171-180
London Assurance, 90-92
Lord Chumley, 23, 74-75, 82, 146
Lord Dundreary, 178
Lotta, 134
Lyceum School of Acting, 77
Lyceum Theatre, erected by Steele Mackaye, 6; success of first play at, 5, 6; cast of first play at, 6; beginning of career as home for stock company, 34; Pinero's plays at, 54-65; successful plays previous to 1899, 75-77; closing of old house 131; opening of new house, 132; history by dates of production of plays, 205-211
Lyceum Theatre Stock Co., organization, 4; permanent assemblage, 32; members of first company, 34; first play by, 36-37; successful career, 90-91; difficulty of securing suitable material for, 102; removal to Daly's Theatre, 75, 131; dissolution, 132

M

Mackay, F. F., 41-42
Mackaye, Steele, 6, 78
Maddern, Minnie (see Mrs. Fiske)
Maister of Woodbarrow, The, 75
Mallory Brothers, 25
Malone, John, 122
Managers, mistakes of, 139-140 (see also Stage Manager)
Mannering, Mary, 35-36, 59, 61, 63, 76, 85
Mansfield, Richard, 28-31, 81, 158, 181
Mantell, Robert, 6, 26
Manuscript, Pinero's, 64-65; Sardou's, 68
Marlowe, Julia, 83-84, 158, 188
Mason, John, 6, 27
McCullough, John, 134, 177
Merrill, Bradford, 4
Miller, Henry, 34-35, 54, 79, 188
Miller, Joaquin, 185
Mills, Frank, 59
Millward, Jessie, 81
Mr. Wilkinson's Widows, 26
Mitchell, Maggie, 48, 134
Modjeska, Mme., 113-116, 118-121, 121-122
Morgan, Edward J., 35, 59, 62
Morris, Felix, 35, 59
Mousetrap, The, 53
Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch, 188, 194

N

Nerves, 75
Nethersole, Olga, 124-126

O

Odell, Maude, 36
Œdipus, 79
Old Heads and Young Hearts, 75, 90-91
O'Neill, James, 122
One of Our Girls, 6, 40-41
Opp, Julie, 35-36, 59, 84-86
Ormonde, Eugene, 80
Osborn, Mrs., 85-86
Owens, John E., 175

P

Pachmann, Vladimir de, 122
Packard, S. S., 37
Paderewski, 121-122, 129
Paid in Full, 188
Palmer's Union Square Company, 3, 5
Parker, Josephine, 23
Phillips, Watts, 192
Pigott, J. W., 18
Pinero, Sir Arthur, 54-65, 69, 193
Platt, George Foster, 77
Plays, difficulty of judging, 14; rehearsal of, 14, 42-43, 145-147; types that succeed in various localities, 59-60; often unsuccessful though meritorious, 90; as made now and in Queen

Elizabeth's day, 97-101; composition of, 139-152; elements of success and failure in, 153-158; examples of good construction in, 160-164; in America and abroad, 171-180, 190-196; transformation into local types, 192; must be sound drama to prove popular, 197
Pride of Jennico, The, 73
Prince and the Pauper, The, 51
Prince Zillah, 118
Princess and the Butterfly, The, 58, 76, 85
Prisoner of Zenda, The, 71, 76
Professor, The, 25
Proud Prince, The, 132
Publicity, unique methods of 17-18

Q

Quality Street, 163-164

R

Rankin, McKee, 181
Raymond, John T., 49-50, 171-172
Rehan, Ada, 109, 122, 182
Rehearsals, opportunities developed during, 42-43, 145-147 (see also Dress Rehearsals)
Reszkes, the De, 125
Richard III, 19-22, 181
Richardson, Abby Sage, 51, 73
Richelieu, 177
Riddle, George, 79
Rip Van Winkle, 90, 174, 149-150
Rivals, The, 91
"Road" companies, beginnings of, 26
Robert Macaire, 147
Robertson, Forbes, 17, 58, 180
Robertson, Madge (see Madge Kendal)
Robertson, Thomas W., 103, 108, 192
Robson, Eleanor, 186
Robson, May, 35–36, 58
Robson, Stuart, 38-41
Rorke, Kate, 58
Rostand, Edmond, 193
Russell, Annie, 28, 122, 131
Ryder, J. F., 180

S

Saenger, Gustav, 122
Saints and Sinners, 69
Sanger, Eugene B., 17
Saratoga, 47, 187
Sardou, Victorien, 48, 66-68, 166, 191, 192-193
School for Scandal, The, 91, 149
Scott, Clement, 124, 193
Scott, Cyril, 35-36, 80
Scrap of Paper, A, 104-106
Second Mrs. Tanqueray, The, 55, 60, 112

Secret Service, 26, 182
Serrano, Vincent, 122
Shakespeare, author of his his plays, 94; imaginary rehearsal of Hamlet, 97-101; popularity in Middle West, 118; relative popularity on East Side and Broadway, 123-124; dramatist and manager, 141
Shannon, Effie, 35, 58, 81, 91
Shaw, Bernard, 29-31
Shaw, Mary, 122
She, 26
Sherlock Holmes, 26, 182, 189
Silver King, The, 69, 164
Skipworth, Alison, 59
Smith, Winchell, 77
Sothern, E. H., 7-9, 11, 13, 15-16, 19, 23, 41, 57, 70, 72-74, 123, 132, 146, 158, 188
Sothern, Edward Askew, 19, 134, 178-179
Souvenirs, first use at Lyceum, 16
Speculators, first appearance at Lyceum, 11
Spong, Hilda, 35-36, 61-62, 76
Stage, requirements of modern, 151-152; appeal of, 159; in England, America, and France, 191, 195; character of present, 199-201
Stage manager, qualifications of, 166-170
Standing, Guy, 122
Stedman, Edmund Clarence, 122
Stewart, Grant, 62
Stock companies, development of new class of, 132-133; old-fashioned, 134-135; plan of organization, 165
Sweet Lavender, 54, 57, 75

T

Taber, Robert, 77
Taliaferro, Edith, 122
Terry, Ellen, 158
Thief, The, 150, 192
Thomas, Augustus, 49, 181
Too Much Johnson, 26, 182
Tree, Beerbohm, 17, 158
Trelawny of the Wells, 58, 61-63, 76
Twain, Mark (see Samuel L. Clemens)
Two Orphans, The, 160
Tyree, Bessie, 35, 58, 59, 62, 64

U

Unitt, E. G., 132

W

Wagenhals, L., 36, 77
Walcot, Charles, 34, 58-59, 62, 79, 91
Walcot, Mrs. Charles, 34, 59, 62, 64, 79
Walker, Mrs. Wm. Wallace (see Ethel Hornick)

Wallack (Lester) Company, 3, 5, 78
Ward, Fanny, 51
Ware, Helen, 77
Warren, William, 27
Webster, Ben, 193
Wheatcroft, Nelson, 34-35, 80, 91
Wheels Within Wheels, 62
Whiffen, Mrs. Thomas, 34, 36, 54, 58-59, 63, 79, 91
Wife, The, 32, 34, 36-39, 75, 89, 163
Williams, Fred, 8
Williams, Fritz, 8, 58, 65, 80, 91
Wilson, Kate Denin, 122
Winter, William, 52
Woman in the Case, The, 194
Woman's Silence, A, 66-68
Woodruff, Harry, 63

Y

Yorick's Love, 176
Young Mrs. Winthrop, 25, 79

COUNTRY LIFE PRESS, GARDEN CITY, N. Y.

BINDING SLIP JAN 25 1970

PN
2266
F7

Frohman, Daniel
Memories of a manager

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY